



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



THE
HOLY EUCHARIST
AND
AURICULAR CONFESSION.

A DEFENCE OF
CHURCH PRINCIPLES AGAINST THE MISCONCEPTIONS
OF THEIR OPPONENTS.

BY
A LAYMAN.

SECOND EDITION, ENLARGED.
AND WITH
AN APPENDIX OF AUTHORITIES



Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope
that is in you with meekness and reverence.

PHILADELPHIA:
JAMES McCAULEY, BOOKSELLER AND PUBLISHER,
1309 CHESTNUT STREET.
1879.

For let the schools have what opinions and doctrines they will,
and let our new masters frame themselves what divinity they list, as
long as neither the one nor the other can get their fancies brought
into the service of the Church, honest men may serve God with one
heart and one soul, and never trouble themselves with the opinions
of them both.

Bp. Cosin's Works, vol. 5, p. 120.

Anglo-Cath. Library.

COLLINS, PRINTER.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

ELEVEN years ago I ventured in the "Layman's Appeal" to address my fellow laymen. I tried to prove then from the Articles and The Book of Common Prayer, that the words of our Church were not, as was asserted, incoherent and hard to understand. But that all our formularies "speak with unfaltering accents the same solemn truths. There is no divergence in their teaching, no diversity in their doctrine. * * * * The truth is but one, and that truth they proclaim in plain and measured and thoughtful words." I showed too from these formularies that "the humblest layman shares in the responsibilities, shares in the privileges of his church. His voice he has a right, nay it is his duty, to use as occasion serves."

I ventured again to address them last summer in the first edition of this pamphlet. It seemed a duty to call attention to the misconception of our Church's teaching on the Incarnation, and the doctrines that spring from it, which had been publicly set forth by one of her authorized ministers. I print now this second edition very considerably enlarged, and with an Appendix of authorities. I dwell in it more fully on the Holy Eucharist. I try to bring forth, as clearly as possible, our Church's views on this subject, as I have learned them, from the Bible, the Book of Common Prayer, the fathers, to whom she refers, the ancient liturgies, which are the source of her liturgy, and her standard divines.

I was taught these views, implicitly, in childhood. There never has been any cause to change. They have been strengthened, developed, rendered clearer, better defined, more precise,

by the daily study of the Word of God, that best comforter in sorrow, truest and faithfullest warner in times of joy and exultation, wherein God speaks face to face, and heart to heart, to him that is willing to learn and to do His will: where God the Father meets you, God the Son supports you, God the Holy Ghost guides and comforts you. By the study of this holy Book, and by intercourse with the great men of old, "saints joyful in glory," and with their godly successors, living and dead, servants of the Most High, men who are thoroughly imbued with its spirit, think with its thoughts, and speak with its words, have these views been matured and confirmed.

In the words of Bishop Montague "What our Church believeth, I believe; what it teacheth, I teach; what it rejecteth, I reject; what it doth not tender, I am not tied unto. If there be anything [herein] against the discipline or doctrine of our Church; I am sorry for it, I revoke it, recant it, disclaim it."

It argues but small confidence in one's cause to raise the cry of Romanism or Ritualism, against views which you cannot refute, and will not be at the pains to understand, or even consider the claims of. It reminds one of the strong and cogent, all powerful and all convincing, argument of the men of Ephesus, against the preaching and teaching of St. Paul, when they "all with one voice about the space of two hours cried out 'Great is Diana of the Ephesians.'"

G. W. H.

PHILADELPHIA, March 3, 1879.

PREFACE.

I PROPOSE to inquire, in the following pages, what the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States *does* really teach and hold concerning the Holy Eucharist and Auricular Confession.

The Prayer Book has been the companion and the guide of my life. I studied it, while a child, in church, when I could not hear or comprehend the good old Bishop's sermons. I study it now, that old age is at hand, and it is new every morning.

In treating of these very holy subjects I have not consciously or willingly wandered from its teaching, or used a word or phrase not found in or justified by it. I apply to it the words of the greatest of all the Christian poets:

Vagliami 'l lungo studio, e 'l grande amore,
Che m 'han fatto cercar lo tuo volume.

Tu duca, tu signore, e tu maestro.

GEORGE W. HUNTER.

PHILADELPHIA, June 29, 1878.

(vii)

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES.

- ANDREWES. On the Eucharist, page 49.
BARLOW. Account of, page 72.
BECON. Eucharist, page 89. Confession, page 88.
BILSON. Eucharist, pages 31, 39.
BINGHAM. Eucharist, page 123. Confession, page 123.
BRAMHALL. Eucharist, page 111. Confession, page 111.
BURNET. Eucharist, pages 48, 117. Confession, page 117.
BUTLER. Account of, page 124.
CHILLINGWORTH. Eucharist, page 106. Confession, page 104.
COSIN. Eucharist, page 40, etc.
COX. Account of, page 75.
CRANMER. Eucharist, page 65. Confession, page 64.
FORBES. Eucharist, page 101.
GHEAST. On Article XXVIII., page 28.
GILBERT. Eucharist, page 42.
GRINDALL. Confession, page 78.
HALL. Eucharist, page 108. Confession, page 109.
HOOKER. Eucharist, pages 48, 95. Confession, page 92.
HORNE. Account of, page 82.
JEWELL. Eucharist, page 80. Confession, page 82.
LATIMER. Eucharist, page 67. Confession, page 65.
LAUD. On the Scottish Liturgy, page 45.
MEDE. Eucharist, page 99. Confession, page 99.
MONTAGUE. Eucharist, pages 137, 143. Confession, pages 137, 144.
PARKER. Eucharist, page 70.
PARKHURST. Account of, page 79.
PILKINGTON. Eucharist, page 85.
PUSEY. On the Incarnation, page 12.
RIDLEY. Eucharist, page 68. Confession, page 65.
SANDYS. Eucharist, page 83.
SCAMBLER. Account of, page 75.
TAYLOR. Eucharist, pages 35, 114. Confession, page 113.
TILLOTSON. Eucharist, page 118. Confession, page 120.
USHER. Eucharist, page 98. Confession, page 98.
WAKE. Eucharist, page 120. Confession, page 121.
WHITGIFT. On the Puritans, page 91.

AD POPULUM.

AT the risk of saying what may sound trite and trifling, I shall begin by stating certain truisms. And it seems to me necessary to state them, because of the inveterate habit many among us have formed of using terms and expressions in a non-natural sense, or of supposing them to be generally so used. They act upon the sentiment, even if they do not actually formulate it, that words were given to us to hide, not to reveal our opinions.

The foundation of all morals, as of all theology, is truth. A religious society, in putting forth its belief, is bound to use words in their plain, natural sense, so that all—friends, foes, and indifferent—may know clearly what is meant. If in process of time some words and phrases have in popular use become somewhat modified in their meaning, then must they be taken to mean what they meant in the mouths of those who first applied them in setting forth their belief; what they meant in *that* period of the history of the language in which the document first issued. New senses and new meanings must not be foisted on them. Nor must their plain, natural meaning be forced awry, because otherwise they seem to teach false doctrine, doctrine not in accordance with the teachings of the Bible, or what is popularly called Protestantism. We have no right to save the society at the expense of truth. If we attempt it, if we make the words mean what they do not mean, we certainly tamper with the truth, and shall as certainly suffer for it in the end, by having our eyes blinded and our ears dulled. The truth will be clear and loud enough, but we shall neither hear nor see.

The formularies of the Protestant Episcopal Church are couched in what was thought to be, and intended to be, clear and unmistakable language. Every word must be taken as it

is, and not as some of us fancy it should be. Whatever they put forth as the doctrine of the Society in any particular point is the doctrine. We have no right to stretch here and trim there in order to avoid some imagined or dreaded danger. And for the purposes of this argument these formularies all stand on the same authority; the adoption, that is, by the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity in General Convention assembled. Some parts of them may have claims upon us above and beyond this; but this they all have, and all have in common.

Moreover, if there is one thing claimed by the Prayer Book from beginning to end, by the Articles, by the Ordinal, it is that the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States is part and parcel of Christ's one Holy Catholic Church throughout the world. According to all their teaching, whatever is Catholic must be right, and good, and holy, and true.

What is the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation?

If it be right to draw comparisons between the different writings which compose the sacred volume, it might safely be asserted that no portion of the New Testament, outside of course of the four Gospels, is more valuable in its teaching, more important in its bearing on the Old Testament, than the Epistle to the Hebrews.

In it at any rate is contained the true meaning of the Law, and its ritual requirements, the true interpretation of the care—minute to the most trifling details—bestowed upon the tabernacle, the victims, and the priests.

Through it we see how true the saying that every page of the Old Testament is full of Him, who was to come, the Messiah, the Christ, the Anointed of God.

God in old times had spoken by prophets, now He speaks by His Son. And this Son, Whom all the angels exultantly worshipped on His first coming into the world, was made lower than they are, made subject to death, that tasting that death for all men He might redeem all men, and be crowned with glory and honour. God has consecrated Him, who is bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh, to be our High Priest forever, with an unchanging priesthood, having one offering once for all to offer, one oblation, even His own holy and spotless body and blood, human, earthly, created, made in time, of

our substance, of our nature, of our infirmities, of our weakness.

Now all of us profess to believe this; to believe, that is, that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, was also verily and indeed the Son of Man. That forasmuch as we, the children of God, are partakers of flesh and blood, so did He also take part of the same. But do we actually and truly believe this? Do we realize what such a belief is? Is it anything more with us than a lazy assent to what we have heard all our lives, and which it is easier to accept than to deny?

I doubt very much whether the doctrine of the Incarnation is held clearly and knowingly by all who use the Prayer Book, and call themselves members of our church. I fear very much that the teaching of Nestorius, condemned at the III General Council, of Ephesus, A. D. 431, can count many adherents among us. It is a teaching more satisfactory to human pride than the Catholic doctrine is. It seems more consonant with human reason. This teaching of Nestorius has at all events been preached unrebuked before our divinity students in one of our largest churches. It has been uttered without reproof upon the floor of our diocesan convention.

And yet this is utterly without excuse. And especially and certainly is it without excuse for those who make their boast of the XXXIX Articles. Who have them ever on their lips, but alas! without much knowledge of their contents.

Let us look for a moment at the Article bearing upon this subject. It reads thus:—

ARTICLE II.—*Of the Word, or Son of God, which was made
very man.*

The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took Man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect Natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very Man; who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.

Two whole and perfect natures were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very Man. The Article embodying the fundamental principles of our Church is clear, and plain, and precise, and Catholic. There is no human person of Christ. We have been taught and know that the second Person of the adorable Trinity took man's nature upon him in the womb of the blessed Virgin.

Some have held that at this time, or at that, at the baptism by John, or at the birth at Bethlehem, the Divine Spirit came upon the man Christ. But the Catholic Church, and our own as part of it, teaches that at the moment when that young and lowly maiden replied to the angel, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it unto me according to thy word;" then the Holy Ghost came upon her;* then God was made man; then the Godhead and manhood were joined together never to be divided. One Person divine and eternal; two natures, two wills, human and divine, thus teaches the Apostles' Creed, the creed of our baptism; thus teaches the II. Article.

This is the doctrine of the Incarnation. The Almighty God, Who made all things, and without Whom was not anything made that was made, dwelt for nine months within the bosom of His virgin mother. Of Him too was it written: "Thou hast covered Me in My mother's womb, I will praise Thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made; marvellous are Thy works; and that My soul knoweth right well. My substance was not hid from Thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in Thy book

* "It was indeed, in my young days, a startling thought when it first flashed upon me, that it must be true that one of our nature, which is the last and lowest of God's rational creation, was raised to a nearness to Almighty God, above all the choirs of Angels or Archangels, Dominions or Powers, above the Cherubim, who seem so near to God, or the Seraphim, with their burning love, close to His throne. Yet it was self-evident, as soon as stated, that she, of whom He deigned to take His human flesh, was brought to a nearness to Himself above all created beings; that she stood single and alone, in all creation or all possible creations, in that in her womb, He who, in His Godhead, is consubstantial with the Father, deigned, as to His human body, to become consubstantial with her."—*Pusey, Eirenicon*, vol. ii. p. 24.

all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them.”*

And when He was born He “drew in the common air, and fell upon the earth, which is of like nature, and the first voice which ‘He’ uttered was crying, as all others do.” He “was nursed in swaddling clothes, and that with cares.”†

He lay upon His mother’s breast and drew nourishment from her as all others do from theirs. He was one of us. He grew in wisdom and in stature. He was an infant, a child, a boy, a man.

Do we really accept this?

The Article is decided enough. There is no hesitation, or doubt, or peradventure in its language.

Why was this wonderful and ineffable mystery wrought? He came to earth to suffer and to die. Man formed in His image had thrown away his birthright, had forsaken his Maker, had transgressed and sinned. By man came sin. By man must sin be done away. Pride must be conquered by humility; disobedience overcome by obedience; lust rooted out by abstinence; hate overmastered by love. One only could do all this; and that the One promised in the Garden of Eden, the Seed of the woman: He That is God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds, and Man, of the substance of His mother, born in the world, perfect God, and perfect Man.

On this fact of the Incarnation all Christianity depends. Its whole system is founded upon it. Its whole teaching hangs upon it, and develops it, and goes back ever to it, as to its source and fountain head.

God has so ordered it that all our spiritual gifts, all the blessings and helps our souls receive come to us through our bodies. We hear with our bodily ears, and our souls are refreshed. The water touches our bodies, and our souls live. The bread and the wine are taken into our mouths, and our souls are strengthened and nourished unto life eternal. In other words, the religion revealed by the Almighty is a sacramental religion. It is a religion of means and appliances, and holy gifts appointed and designated by Himself, which man cannot

* Psalm cxxxix, 13, &c.

† Wisdom vii. 8.

alter, nor meddle with; to the Jews a stumbling block, and to the Greeks foolishness, but to us who are called, the wisdom and power of God. "But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are; that no flesh should glory in His presence."*

God has chosen the weakest of all things, and the commonest of all things, water, and bread, and wine, and oil,† to be vehicles and instruments of grace. The word, says St. Augustine, is added to the element and the sacrament is, (*i. e.*, becomes a sacrament.)‡ And even this word which when spoken by God's servant is added to the element, and the sacrament comes into being; this word itself is but the breath of man. God has chosen these weak things and by them works mighty things. And by His ordinance these mighty things cannot be worked without these weak things. Without the use of these humble means, He does not give His spiritual gifts. Without water He will not give the new life in which we are born again the children of God and heirs of eternal life. He has tied the gift fast to the base means. The haughty looks of man must be humbled. His pride must be brought low. Water and the word spoken by the breath of man, these are the means. How can there be the sacrament without the living water? How can there be the sacrament without the spoken word; the breathed utterance of the living man?

But if God, for His own wise reasons, withhold the means, does He therefore withhold the grace? Who will say so? These are the secret things of the Lord our God, Who is above all things, a Lord of mercy and of love. What He has revealed, that we know, and His will we must follow. What He has not revealed, no man by searching can find out. Can we not trust Him? Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?

* I Corinthians, i. 27, &c.

† Acts ix. 36, x. 47, I Corinthians, xi. 23, etc., S. James, v. 14.

‡ Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum. In Joannis Evangelium lxxx. 3.

God has chosen and blessed these simple fruits of the earth, and water, without which, in His providence, the earth could not bring them forth, and has made them, as was said above, instruments and vehicles of grace. It is His choosing and His blessing that makes them acceptable. When man chose these as his offering, when the first-born of Eve, the man she had gotten of the Lord, brought of the best his toil and the sweat of his brow had produced, and presented them to the Lord, they were rejected. How strange is this, and how contrary to human thought and reason. Abel slays the innocent firstling of his flock, he takes away life, he causes useless pain, and destroys enjoyment and guiltless pleasure, and his offering is accepted. How contrary again to human thought and human reason. And the explanation given is, that one brother walked by faith, and the other walked by sight. "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts; and by it he being dead yet speaketh."

Once it would seem then, the bloody sacrifice was commanded, and faith obeyed. Now there is no more bloody sacrifice and again faith obeys.

Christ, by the sacrifice of Himself, has done away forever all the bloody offerings of the law. He is the one and only Sacrifice, the one and only Oblation: but He is also the one and only Sacrament.

Christ is the Priest. Christ is the Victim. Through Him only we have access to the Father. But such is the glory of the Incarnation, such the exaltation bestowed upon the humiliation of the eternal Son, that God has ordained that all His spiritual gifts and blessings should come to us through the human nature of Christ.

The mystery of mysteries, the great secret of the Gospel, the real difficulty of the Christian religion, is the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist.

His ministry on earth was drawing to its close when at Capernaum He uttered that memorable discourse preserved to us in the VI Chapter of St. John. There were present those that had followed His teaching, had received Him as the great Prophet come from God, had acknowledged that in some way He

was the Son of God, that from Him should come deliverance unto Israel, that even Gentiles should hear and be saved. To them thus prepared He made the strange and startling declaration contained in that chapter, and many said, "How can this Man give us His flesh to eat?" Did He withdraw His assertion, did He explain it? Those who would receive it, received it. Those who would reject it, rejected it. Those who received it brooded over it in their hearts, and when on the night in which He was betrayed, He took bread and brake and gave it to them, they knew what He was doing, that He was giving them that flesh which is meat indeed, and that blood which is drink indeed.

As in His history, so in the history of His Church. It was not until seventy years had elapsed, until the Christian religion had spread far and wide, until one generation after another had shared in that bread of life, that this wonderful chapter was written down by St. John, and given to all the faithful, for their comfort and their instruction.

And so also with each of us. We read of the glories of His majesty in the kingly gospel of St. Matthew, of Christ the royal prophet, prince of the house of David, sitting upon His holy seat. We learn in it His teaching, a teaching which explained and enlarged that of Moses and the prophets.

We read of His humility and deprivations; His dwelling with the wild beasts of the desert; His exhaustion and amazement; in the gospel of St. Mark, so human, so stripped of all earthly grandeur, so full of grief, and misery and sorrow.

We read of the priestly Victim, of the Son of the Highest born of one blessed above women, in the gospel of St. Luke, so full of unction, and comfort, and love, and trust.

All these we read, ere we come to that most marvellous and heart-searching of all the writings of the Book of God, "the heavenly gospel of the blessed John;" and in that gospel come to that great central fact contained in this VI Chapter. The other three evangelists had told of the miraculous feeding of the multitude, the five thousand, with the five loaves and two fishes. It was reserved for St. John to tell us of the true bearing of this miracle, and of the startling revelation then made by our blessed Lord. All cannot receive it. Many say to-day:

"How can this Man give us His flesh to eat?" They forget His other words: "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." They give all a carnal interpretation and meaning, and think that only to be real, which is material.

What other of the sons of men sent by heaven, or thinking himself so sent, to convert and reform his fellows, ever spake in such strange terms as these? Did Confucius, or the Buddha, or Zoroaster, or Socrates? Did Enoch, or Moses, or David, or Samuel, or Isaiah, or Ezekiel? Did Elijah, or his great successor, John Baptist? Did any of them stand up and say: "I am the living Bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this Bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. As the living Father has sent Me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth Me, even he shall live by Me."

In this too, He was unlike all men; He was alone among the children of men.

He taught them at Capernaum. He teaches us now. What are His words? "He that eateth Me, shall live by Me." And how are we to do this, without the doing of which we shall not live forever? He tells us, "Take eat, this is My body which is broken for you. This cup is the New Testament in My blood, which is shed for you. Drink ye all of it." When we eat that bread, and drink that cup, we eat and drink Him.

Our blessed Lord emptying Himself of His glory, taking upon Him our flesh, bearing the form of a servant, hiding His divinity, standing a man among men, standing the one true and only priest, on the night in which He was betrayed, the day before He suffered, took into His holy, pure, and spotless hands, bread, and brake it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, "This is My body." He did this, when He had first given thanks (*ευχαριστίας*). This is the unbloody Sacrifice. This is the great oblation. He offered Himself a spotless Victim for the sins of the whole world.

Here in this culminating act of self-immolation, His active ministry drew to its close. He had finished the work that was given Him to do. Here He, of perfect and free will, began to carry into effect, that which He had decreed, and resolved

upon, before the beginning of the world. Unconstrained, unforced, of His mere motion, and pure love, He consigned His natural body to the cross, that He might die for all men. Here, while heaven and earth waited breathlessly in mute and awful expectation, and hell trembled to her foundations, He began the one and only oblation, which He finished, when on the accursed tree He commended into His Father's hands His human spirit, yielding up the ghost. For thirty years He had lived unknown and unnoticed by His people. For three years He had gone in and out among them doing good, healing and helping them. His life of action ended here. Henceforth He suffered, He endured, His all holy will consenting to the end. Here for the last time, He was, so to speak, a free agent.* Of His own will He gave up His freedom. Of His own will He forbore to use His power, a power which was still omnipotent, even in His deepest debasement. "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to My Father, and He shall presently give Me more than twelve legions of angels?"

When they scourged Him, when they mocked Him, when they nailed Him to the cross, He was passive and yielding, the Lamb led to the slaughter. Even in the garden, in that last struggle of His human will, when He was heard because of His piety,† and one far blessed above all other messengers of God, was sent to strengthen Him; even then it was the holy, immaculate, and entirely conscious Victim, Who had given Himself without reserve to the will of His Father. The Sacrifice, as far as His active agency was concerned, was, in will

* S. Gregory Nyssen, (A. D. 372,) says: "Christ stays not until He was under a necessity by being betrayed, and until the Jews had seized Him by violence, or until Pilate had unjustly condemned Him, and so their malice had proved the principal occasion and cause of the salvation of mankind; but by His oeconomy He prevents their seizure of Him; and by a method of sacrifice, He offered Himself an oblation for us. When was this? When He made His own Body eatable and His Blood potable to those who were with Him. When He gave His Body to His disciples to be eaten, His Body was already sacrificed ineffably and invisibly according to the will and pleasure of Him who had the oeconomy of this mystery."

† Hebrews, v. 7.

'Quoted in Johnson's *Unbloody Sacrifice*. Works, vol. 1, p. 136, Anglo-Catholic Library. The original is given in the Appendix, p. 24, b.

and purpose complete, when He had made the oblation in that upper room, and had prayed for us all in the great Intercession.* Everything else followed in necessary sequence. He Himself says, This is My body, which is broken (*κλαμμενον*); This is My blood which is shed (*εχχυόμενον*). Not which is going to be, but which is—which is now at this moment. Here and here only did He exercise His priesthood; He the true Melchisedec, bringing forth bread and wine; here and here only on this earth, before the fire of death had passed upon Him, over whose body it had no power.

He hath entered into the holy of holies by a way not made with hands, and ever liveth to make intercession for us: JESUS CHRIST, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.

What do our formularies have to say on the matter now before us—The Holy Eucharist? It seems to me that it would be impossible for the wit of man using the English language to set forth more unambiguously than they do, the firm, unwavering belief in the real, true, actual, living, objective, spiritual presence of our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, according to His most true and gracious promise, in the Holy Eucharist, as opposed to the virtual and imaginary, the carnal and corporeal, or the dead presence, all of which notions have their adherents and their active partisans.

Let us take up these formularies one by one. And first, “the Catechism; that is to say, an instruction, to be learned by every person before he be brought to be confirmed by the Bishop,” which some of us learned at our mother’s knee before we could speak plainly, or were able to read alone for ourselves. What does it teach the little children who have been born again of water and the Holy Ghost? Let us read carefully both question and answer.

“Q. What is the outward part or sign of the Lord’s Supper?
A. Bread and wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received.
Q. What is the inward part, or thing signified? A. The body and blood of Christ, which are spiritually (in the English Book ‘verily

* St. John, xvii.

and indeed') taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper. Q. What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby? A. The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine."

The present bread feeds our bodies; the present Body and Blood of Christ strengthen and refresh our souls. There is nothing virtual, or dead, or absent here. The bread is actually and really present; the force of logic would compel us, were it not for prejudice, to acknowledge the actual and real presence, spiritual and objective, of the Body and Blood of Christ.

The Body and the Blood are taken and received; they are the inward part, the thing signified. And then, having been taken and received, they strengthen and refresh the soul. Surely our souls are as truly living as our bodies. And we are taught as little children to believe and to hold that both soul and body are fed in this Sacrament, the carnal and visible by the carnal and visible; the spiritual and invisible by the spiritual and invisible. The sign is the Bread and Wine. The thing signified is the Body and the Blood of Christ. The outward part is one, the inward part is another. Language more carefully chosen, men learned or unlearned, have never seen. Dare we say it is language chosen to mislead? chosen on purpose to deceive Christ's little ones? of whom, He told us, is the kingdom of Heaven. We dare not say so. Then it does mean what it says, and our souls are fed and strengthened and refreshed by that divine and heavenly food.

Having learned this Catechism—knowing, as our tender years allow, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the ten Commandments, and all other things contained in it—we are brought to the Bishop, and receive at his hands the sevenfold gift of the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, "the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and ghostly strength, the spirit of knowledge and true godliness, the spirit of God's holy fear." And now we are held worthy to come to the "heavenly feast." We are held worthy, I say, through His mercy and by His merits alone. Of ourselves, vile earth and miserable sinners; but by Him made kings and priests, we are called and exhorted and forced by all the pleading of His

mighty love to "come to feed on the banquet of that most heavenly food."

In the exhortation read when the minister giveth warning for the celebration of the Holy Communion, are these words: "to administer to all such as shall be religiously and devoutly disposed, the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, to be by them received in remembrance of His meritorious Cross and Passion; *whereby alone* we obtain remission of our sins,* and are made partakers of the kingdom of Heaven." To what do these words "*whereby alone*" refer? Some tell us to the phrase "the most comfortable Sacrament," an interpretation which seems justified by the next sentence:—

"Wherefore it is our duty to render most humble and hearty thanks to Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, for that He hath given His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that Holy Sacrament."

And then comes the very solemn admonition "to consider the dignity of that holy mystery," and to prepare ourselves to come holy and clean "to such a heavenly feast." An absent Christ, a virtual, dead, carnal presence of His blessed Body and Blood, cannot be our spiritual food and sustenance.

* "Grant, O Lord, that whosoever shall receive in this place the blessed sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, may come to that holy ordinance with faith, charity, and true repentance; and being filled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, may, to their great and endless comfort, obtain remission of their sins, and all other benefits of His passion."

This prayer from The Form of Consecration of a Church, set forth in June, A. D. 1799, certainly teaches the very highest doctrine. The words here used seem to authorize the interpretation mentioned in the text.

But if this be so, then certainly Christ is very specially present: Christ God and Man personally present: present under the forms of bread and wine: present with the consecrated elements: present in the holy mysteries; present in the blessed sacrament. All of which words mean precisely the same thing.

"And to be brief, thus much more the faithful see, hear, and know, the favourable mercies of God sealed, the satisfaction of Christ towards us confirmed, and the remission of sin established."*

* Concerning the Sacrament. The Homilies, page 398. Oxford, 1840.

Here we have it stated plainly that the present Christ, living and life-giving, really, truly, and spiritually present, is our food and sustenance in that Holy Sacrament. A holy mystery it is; the manner and mode of that presence unknown and unrevealed to us, but nevertheless sure and true; a mystery to be accepted and rested in.

In the other exhortation to be used when the people are negligent to come to the Holy Communion, the minister says:—

“Wherefore, according to mine office, I bid you, in the name of God, I call you in Christ’s behalf, I exhort you, as ye love your own salvation, that ye will be partakers of this Holy Communion.”

Surely these are very solemn words; and look as if there was some reality spoken of and intended.

In the exhortation, “at the time of the celebration of the Communion,” the priest says:—

“He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of His love, and for a continual remembrance of His death, to our great and endless comfort.”

Can any words express a reality more clearly than these do? Consider them, and remember under what circumstances they are to be spoken, and by a priest alone; holy mysteries, pledges of Christ’s love, a continual remembrance of His death, our great and endless comfort, ordained and instituted by Christ himself.

The prayer of humble access, made by the priest kneeling, in the name of all those who *shall receive* the Communion, must be quoted entire. Every word in it tells the same story. Ponder them and decide.

We do not presume to come to this Thy table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in Thy manifold and great mercies. We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under Thy table. But Thou art the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy: Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His blood,* that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and

* “That our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood.”

The reasonable soul and human flesh are one man. The expression body

our souls washed through His most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us. *Amen.*

And especially worthy of note is the last half of it. "Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood." Surely if these words do not mean precisely what they say, then are they most carefully chosen to deceive and mislead us. We are promised a blessing which is, unless they are true, no blessing, but a sham and a delusion, and a snare. Thanks be to God! they are true and real, and spiritual, and holy; and both promise and blessing are sure and steadfast.

The prayer of consecration, unequalled, I think, in its sublime beauty by that in any liturgy, Greek, or Latin, incomparably superior to the Roman,* fuller and more complete than that of our English mother, what have its sacred words to tell us of this spiritual presence? After reciting, with all or nearly all the other liturgies, the words of institution of our blessed Lord, there follows *the Oblation*, the offering to the Almighty Father the holy gifts, the celebrating with them, and making the memorial before Him, which Christ commanded to be made; and then *the Invocation*, when God our merciful Father is besought to hear us, and of His almighty goodness to vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with His Word and Holy Spirit, these His gifts and creatures of bread and wine:—

and soul exhausts the subject. Where the body and soul are, there the whole man is. Where the body and blood of Christ are, there is Christ Himself. And as the divinity and humanity of Christ are inseparably connected, wherever the body and blood of Christ are, there is Christ both God and Man.

* "Incomparably superior to the Roman." We never compare the elements, after consecration, to any sacrifices made by man, but the Roman Canon reads:—

"Supra quæ propitio ac sereno vultu respicere digneris; et accepta habere, sicuti accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri tui justî Abel et sacrificium Patriarchæ nostri Abrahæ," etc.

"Upon which may it please Thee to look with favourable and gracious countenance, and to accept them, even as it pleased Thee to accept the gifts of thy righteous servant Abel, the sacrifice of our Patriarch Abraham," etc.

“That we receiving them according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ’s holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood. And we most earnestly desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.”

The heart revolts at the suggestion that these words do not mean what they say. When every epithet, every word that can suggest solemnity and reverence, and awe, and heartfelt worship is employed without stint or fear of saying too much; but with the deep feeling that all human words fall short of expressing the greatness of the mystery, the wonderfulness of the gift, the gracious condescension and love of the giver, and the unworthiness of us the recipients of such surpassing blessings.

When all have communicated and the Lord’s Prayer has been reverently said by all, priest and people, then comes the prayer of praise and thanksgiving.

“Almighty and ever-living God, we most heartily thank Thee for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ; and dost assure us thereby of Thy favour and goodness towards us; and that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of Thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people.”

The Protestant Episcopal Church to which we belong makes us here thank the Almighty and ever-living God for feeding us with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of Christ, and for assuring us thereby of His favour and goodness. Is not this the truth, or do we approach the Almighty with a lie in our right hand? Do we give Him thanks for naught, for doing what He does not do? Do we make a mock of Him? Is it this our Church teaches us to do in this very highest act of worship: an act which has been prepared for, with all the pomp and purpose possible, with chaunt, and prayer, and hymn, and thanksgiving, and confession, and forgiveness? It may not be. All these words must be taken in their plain natural sense as conveying the meaning which they seem to convey. We are fed, our souls and our bodies, by the most precious Body and Blood of Christ,

by His human Body and His human Soul, which (as the Second Article has told us, as we have read above), He, the Word of the Father, took upon Him "in the womb of the blessed Virgin," whereby "two whole and perfect natures, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, *never to be divided*, whereof is one Christ, very God and very Man." For deny this and you are met by the First Article, "There is but one living and true God, *without body, parts, or passions*." The only body Christ has, the only soul Christ has, the perfection of human nature which He thus has, He took of the substance of the blessed Virgin, His mother, and with them He ascended into heaven, and there sitteth "perfect God and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one Man, so God and Man is one Christ." And we are taught to thank God further that we who have duly received those holy mysteries are very members incorporate in the mystical body of His Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people. Then are the gifts real, and true, and actual, and spiritual.

The thirty-nine Articles so called, though with us there are but thirty-eight (Article XXI. of the Authority of General Councils, being omitted, "because it is partly of a local and civil nature, and is provided for, as to the remaining parts of it, in other Articles"), were established by the General Convention of 1801. In examining them we have the advantage of the fact that the Articles of the Church of England, from which ours are taken, are of authority there in both the Latin and English languages. Should there be any dispute about the meaning of a word or phrase, it would be proper to turn to the corresponding Article of the English Church, in its Latin version, to settle the meaning.

Article XXV. says: Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens (*notæ*), but rather they be certain (*quædam*) sure (*certa*) witnesses and effectual (*efficacia*) signs of grace. They are badges, all agree to that. But they are more truly (rather, *potius*) sure witnesses, witnesses that cannot fail, signs, of grace effectual, efficacious, actually producing the effects

designed and intended ; a real living objective something done to us and in us, not a subjective nothing of our own minds. All do not agree to this. And yet this is precisely what the Article says opposing Zwingli, and Calvin, and Luther, and all Puritans of whatever name. God works by them invisibly in us. This is real and spiritual. It is not virtual, nor is it carnal. He quickens, gives life to our faith in baptism. He strengthens and confirms our faith in the Lord's Supper. He does this in both cases by them, by these effectual signs of grace and good will. He works effectively. He produces all His good will designed and intended, provided only we place no bar in the way ; provided only we do not resist and render futile all His grace. His work, as far as He is concerned, is perfect. We may mar and destroy. This is all very real and true.

"By Sacraments," says the learned and devout Bishop Forbes, of Brechin, in his work on the Articles:

"God works invisibly in us. All grace flows from the humanity of Jesus Christ, and the Sacraments are main channels whereby that grace flows into the soul. Christ is the chief and principal worker in all Sacraments, as a function of His everlasting priesthood. They work in us by means of the institution of Christ. He has merited for us all things necessary to salvation, and these are freely bestowed upon us by God, if our free wills only consent to receive them. This consent to receive grace, in other words, expresses itself as repentance and faith."

This is precisely what is told us in the Catechism.

"Q. What meanest thou by this word *Sacrament*? A. I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us ; ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof."

And to the reception of either Sacrament, repentance and faith are prerequisites. Our consent is given to God's good-will and work.

Sometimes the evil (Article XXVI.) have chief authority in the ministrations of the Sacraments ; yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, we may use their ministry. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts

diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments, which be effectual because of Christ's institution and promise. Here again they are spoken of as objective realities, carrying with them divine power, hindered only by ourselves of their work in us, and not by the channel through which they reach us.

"The Supper of the Lord (Article XXVIII.) is not only a sign of the love, etc., but rather (*potius*) it is a Sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death." This drives away with a breath all the sophistry of Zwingli and Calvin and their followers of every shade. It is this sign which they maintain it to be, and alone to be; but it is vastly, incomprehensibly, more than this. It is a Sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death, inasmuch that to such as rightly (*rite*), worthily (*digne*) and with faith receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking (*communicatio*) of the Body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking (*communicatio*) of the Blood of Christ.

Now here it is manifest that the whole expression is taken from St. Paul's 1 Corinthians x. 16. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" The word in the Bible translated communion in the original *κοινωνία*, in the Latin version *communicatio*, is very inadequately rendered in the English of the Article by *partaking*. The Latin Vulgate has it *communicatio*; while, strange to say, the Douay version gives it "the bread which we break, is it not the *partaking* of the body of the Lord?" Communion seems to mean a good deal more than partaking. And yet partaking itself gives a full enough meaning for our present purpose. "He who drinks of this cup," says Bengel,* "is a partaker of the blood of Christ: so, verse 18, *they who eat*. The highest degree of reality is implied. Now he who is a partaker of the blood and body of Christ is also a partaker of the sacrifice that was offered on the cross; a partaker, in short, of Christ Himself."

This then teaches a real, living, objective, true partaking of

* I suppose he is fairly translated in the edition published by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1858. I have not the original by me.

Something very real and very true, for "the Body of Christ [and here this word means of course body and blood] is given, taken and eaten [which includes the drinking] in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner."* Something

* "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner."

"We know," says Dr. Pusey, "from the framer of the Article himself, that he intended by these words, 'after a spiritual and heavenly manner,' only to exclude the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving of Christ's body."

And in the note he adds :

"In a letter to Lord Burleigh Dec. 22, 1566, preserved in the State-Paper office, Domestic Correspondence, T., xli, No. 51. An account of it is given in the 'Calendar of State Papers.' I have had it collated with the original and have myself verified it."

"Edmund Gheast, Bishop of Rochester to Cecil.

Greeting in ye Lord.

Right Honourable—I am verye sorye yt you are so sick : God make yow whole, as it is my desyer and prayer. I wold have seen yow er this, accordinge to my duetye and good will, but when I sent to knowe whether I might see yow, it was often answered yt yow were not to be spoken with.

I suppose yow have hard how ye Bisshop of Glocestre [Cheney] found him selve greeved with ye placynge of this adverb *onely* in this article, 'The bodye of Christ is gyven, taken and eaten in ye Supper after an heavenly and spirituall manner onely,' by cause it did take away ye presence of Christis bodye in ye Sacrament ; prively noted me to take his part therein, and yeasterdaye in myn absence more playnely touched me for the same. Whereas betweene him and me I told him plainely, that this word *onelye* in ye foresaid article did not exclude ye presence of Christis Body fro the Sacrament, but onely ye grossness and sensibleness in ye receavinge thereof. Ffor I saied unto him, though he took Christis bodye in his hand, receaved it with his mouthe, and that corporally, naturally, reallye, substantially, and carnally, as ye doctors doo write, yet did he not, for all that, see it, feale it, smelle it, nor taste it. And therefore I told him I wold speake against him herein, and ye rather by cause ye article was of myn owne pennynge. And yet I wold not, for all that, denye thereby any thing that I had spoken for ye presence. And this was some of our talke.

And this that I saied is so true by all sortes of men, that even D. Hardinge writeth the same, as it appeareth most evidently by his wordes reported in ye Bisshoppe of Salisburie's [Jewel] booke pagina 228, wich be thees : then we may saye, yt in ye sacrament his verye body is present, yea, really, that

real is given, something real is taken, something real is eaten and drunken. There is no virtual, or imaginary, or subjective presence here. Nor, on the other hand, is there any carnal or corporeal presence. For what is eaten and drunken is done only after an heavenly and spiritual manner, and the mean is Faith. But we have faith in what is, not in what is not; and we share by faith, as a medium, in what is, not in what is not. The things that are seen are temporal. The things that are not seen are eternal. I think I have shown that the Articles hold the same doctrine as the Catechism and the Communion service, namely, that there is a real and spiritual presence of our blessed Lord in the Holy Eucharist.

But if our Lord be present, and present after a very especial manner, what follows? Let the saintly Andrewes, whose fame is in all the Church, as of sweet ointment poured forth, answer: "Christ Himself, the Thing signified of the Sacrament, in and with the Sacrament, is to be worshipped."

But it is not Protestant to adore Christ in the Eucharist. So much the worse for Protestantism. To adore Christ every where, and at all times, in every place and in every manner, is anyhow Christian. For He is very God of very God; One with the Father. But is it "un-Protestant" to worship Christ present in the Eucharist?

is to saye, indeede, substantially, that is, in substance, and corporally, carnally and naturally; by which wordes is ment that his verye bodye, his verye fleshe, and his verye humane nature, is there, not after corporall carnall or naturall wise, but invisibly, unspeakeably, supernaturally, spiritually, divinely, and by waye unto him only known.

This I thought good to write to yowr honour for myn owne purgation. The Almightye God restore yow to your old health, and longe keepe yow in the same, with encrease of vertue and honour.

Yours whole to his poor powre

EDM. ROFFENS."

Endorsed 22 December 1566 B. of Rochester to myself. Superscribed "To the Right Honourable and his singler good freind Sir Willm. Cecill Knight, principall Thresaure to ye Quenes Matie."¹

Gheast (Guest, Geste, the name is spelled all these ways) remained in England during Mary's reign. He belonged strictly to the catholic minded in the Church of England. Upon him devolved, owing to Parker's illness, says Hardwick, the principal burden of revising the Prayer Book.

¹ Dr. Pusey: "The Real Presence the doctrine of the English Church, 1857," p. 203.

Among the unmixed blessings, which the Reformation in its later stages gave us, is the authorized version of the Holy Scriptures; a version which was carefully compared with all that had preceded it, and which embraces all the good of all, and avoids many and most of their errors. That it is not perfect, is but to say that it is the work of man; but it has held its own for more than two hundred and fifty years, carrying its untold blessings to myriads upon myriads of God's children, lightening their darkness, feeding, satisfying their hunger and their thirst, and strengthening and supporting them in life's manifold labors and distresses.

Perhaps the most learned of those divines who were employed on this great work, by appointment of King James I.—and this good work of his should atone for many of his foibles, and errors, and follies—was Thomas Bilson, Bishop of Winchester. So great indeed was his reputation for learning, that to him and Bishop Miles Smith, of Gloucester, was confided the final revision of the labors of the translators. Four of his treatises have come down to us. Three of these are written against the Puritans. The first and second are on the Sufferings of our Lord, and the Descent into Hell; the third, which was reprinted in 1842, is on "The Perpetual Government of Christ's Church;" "one of the ablest treatises in favor of Episcopacy ever written."

"It is in this book," says the editor, Robert Eden, "that we find the richest produce of his theological learning, as well as the most important employment of the same. In this book he has established his claim to be considered one of the most learned divines of his own or any period."

The fourth and last is written against the Jesuits. It is a small quarto of some 850 pages, very closely printed, in black letter, Roman and Italic, and not at all easy to the eye that reads. It is dedicated to the most excellent, virtuous, and noble princess Elizabeth, by the grace of God, Queene of England, France, and Ireland, Defendor of the Faith, etc.; and was written by instruction of that sovereign. The title runs:—

"The true difference betweene Christian subjection and unchristian rebellion: wherein the Prince's lawful power to command for

trueth, and indeprivable right to beare the sword are defended against the Pope's Censures and the Jesuits' sophismes uttered in their apologie and defence of English Catholikes: with a demonstration that the things reformed in the Church of England by the Lawes of this realme are truly Catholike, notwithstanding the vaine shew made to the contrary in their late Rhemish Testament: by Thomas Bilson, Warden of Winchester. Perused and allowed by publike authority. Oxford, 1585."

Bilson was born in Winchester, educated in the school there, of which, on his return from the university, he became master, then warden, then Bishop of Worcester, 1596, and the next year Bishop of Winchester, and privy counsellor to the Queen, or in the words of Sir John Harington, in his "*Nugæ Antiquæ*":—

"From Schoolmaister of Winchester he became Warden, and having been infinitely studious and industrious in poetrie, in philosophie, in physick, and lastly (which his genius chieflie called him to) in divinity; he became so compleat, for skill in languages, for readiness in the fathers, for judgement to make use of his readings, that he was found fit to be no longer a souldier, but a commander-in-chiefe in our spirituall warfare, being first made Bishop of Worcester, and after of Winchester."

I propose to quote a few passages from the fourth part of this treatise on "The True Difference." The whole treatise is cast into the form of a dialogue between *Theophilus*, the Christian, and *Philander*, the Jesuit; and is divided into four parts. This fourth part forms about one-third of the whole, and "sheweth the Reformation of this realme to be warranted by the Word of God and the ancient faith of Christ's Church, and the Jesuites for all their crakes to be nothing lesse than Catholikes." Along the margius are the notes and references, and a running commentary on the paragraph opposite it. On page 708 the marginal comment is:—

"It is one to adore Christ, which is in the mysteries, and another to adore the mysteries themselves, which no father teacheth;" and the text opposite is: "*Philander*. They (*i.e.*, the fathers) say the Sacrament must be adored. *Theophilus*. They say Christ must be adored. *Phil*. Yea; but in the mysteries, and on the altar. *Theo*. So Christ is to be adored in heaven, in His Church, and most of all

in our own hearts and bodies; will you thence collect that either heaven, or the temple, or ourselves are to be adored? *Phil.* But neither heaven nor the temple are Sacraments. *Theo.* Yet Christ is adored in them, though they be not in like sort with Him, and so may Christ be adored in the mysteries, though the mysteries themselves may have no such honour."

Again, on page 709:—

"*Phil.* The same father in another place saith of the Sacrament, No man eateth it before he adore it. *Theo.* Are you not desperately set, that to defile yourselves with open idolatry, will force the fathers to fit your humours against their own speeches? St. Augustine saith of Christ's flesh which He took of the Virgin Mary, *Nemo illam carnem manducat nisi prius adoraverit.* No man eateth that flesh of Christ unless he first adore it. You make no more bones at the matter, but strike *The flesh* (of Christ) out of St. Augustine's words, and refer adoration to the corporal creature, which the priest holdeth in his fingers. Is not this, trowe you, sound dealing in the greatest mysteries of our salvation, and imminent peril of your damnation, purposely to shut your eyes lest you should see the truth or agnise the rashness of your new-found adoration? What have St. Augustine's words to do with your adoring the mystical signs, when he directly nameth the flesh of Christ, which is both eaten with the spirit, and adored in the spirit; yea, the very eating of it is the adoring of it, since it is not eaten but by believing, hoping and rejoicing in it, which are the chief branches of God's divine honour."

Again, page 710, the margin reads:—

"We adore Christ in them, we adore not the mysteries themselves." And the text, "*Phil.* St. Ambrose saith, We adore the flesh of Christ in the mysteries. *Theo.* Verily, and so do we; but the mysteries and sacraments themselves we do not adore."

Again, on page 711, the marginal comment is:—

"Christ is adored in the mysteries, though He be not locally inclosed in them." And the text reads, "*Theo.* * * * Christ you prove is adored in the mysteries and on the altar. Why should He not be adored in all places, and in all His gifts, and for all the monuments of His grace and mercy bequeathed us in this life that He may prepare us for the next? And if this rule be general, how great cause have we to adore Him in the Water, where He cleanseth

us from our sins; and at the Table, where He feedeth and strengtheneth our soules and spirits with their proper nourishment, which is the precious ransom that was paid to recover us from death and hell, and to bring us to His immortal light and bliss? What Christian heart recounting His abundant goodness and fatherly readiness with His own stripes to heal us, with His own blood to wash us, with His own death to quicken us, will not be resolved into prayers and tears, to yield all honour and adoration to Him that doth offer us these treasures at and on His table?"

Plainly then this is not a doctrine excluded from the Church, since it did not prevent Thomas Bilson, Warden of Winchester, from being promoted to the bishopric of the same name; nor from being "appointed to add the last hand in the translation of the Bible, commanded by King James the First."

The table is covered with a fair linen cloth. The alms have been taken up and reverently brought to the priest, who has humbly presented and placed them upon the holy table. The priest has then placed upon the table so much bread and wine as he thinks sufficient, and he says, "Let us pray for the whole state of Christ Church militant." And note here that our Church has stricken out the words, "here on earth." But he goes on: "and we also bless Thy Holy Name for all Thy servants, departed this life in Thy faith and fear; beseeching Thee to give us grace so as to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom." Shall we not think of our own dead as these words go up to our Father? Has death cut us off from them? God forbid!

Then comes the confession and priestly absolution, and then the comfortable words, the kiss of peace, and then the "lift up your hearts," and then with all the nine orders of the heavenly ones we sing the thrice Holy, and then the prayers of humble access and of consecration.

Were our eyes opened as Elisha's servant's were, would we too see what the old man in St. Chrysostom's days claimed to have seen, and to which that holy man gave credence?

"For then the angels stand near the priest, and the place around the altar is filled, and the host of the heavenly ones cry out to the glory of Him that lieth thereon."

May the blessed angels worship, gazing in awe upon the mighty mystery of the redemption! and may not we, for whom it was wrought, for whose sake God was made man and dwelt among us, emptying himself of His glory, and dying that we might live?

The priest has himself received, he has given both kinds to the people, in order, into their hands, all devoutly kneeling, and the Sacrifice is at length complete by the partaking of the worshippers.

The door is opened in heaven, and the Lamb, as It had been slain, stands in the midst of the throne, and the four living creatures and the four and twenty elders fall down and worship, and sing a new song, unto Him that had been slain, and had redeemed them out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation, and had made them kings and priests unto God.

And we, too, join in the new song sung by the holy ones on the plains of Bethlehem: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace." And we add, "O Lord, the only begotten Son Jesus Christ, Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. Thou, that sittest at the right hand of God the Father, have mercy upon us. For Thou only art holy; Thou only art the Lord; Thou only, O Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most High in the glory of God the Father. Amen." For the Lamb, slain before the foundation of the world, is He that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, which is in heaven.

We worship Christ present in the Holy Eucharist.* We do not limit nor define that presence. We do not localize it. We do not confine it to the consecrated elements. How could such a thing be? Does not the service itself say: Lift up your hearts. Do not our thoughts and hearts rise to the throne of God and to Him that sitteth at the right hand of the Father? Jesus, our Lord, is glorified, and we know

* Canon VI. passed at the 18th Session of the Council of Trent, shows the object of all Eucharistic adoration, as taught by the Roman Church. "*Si quis dixerit, in sancto Eucharistiæ sacramento Christum unigenitum Dei Filium non esse cultu latræ, etiam externo, adorandum—anathema sit.*" * *

Him Who He is, for the Holy Ghost is given. We know and we worship. Just as we know Him and worship Him as One with the Father, whenever we kneel to pray, so do we worship Him present in a special, wonderful, mysterious, unexplained, and unexplainable way in the holy sacrament of His body and blood. We remember His great humility, and His tremendous majesty. We keep together (we do not separate even in thought), His true humanity taken in the womb of His blessed mother and His true divinity, very God of very God.* Whoever can accept the fact of the Incarnation, can and ought to accept all that flows from it: even the mystery of the Holy Eucharist, which is the crowning act of His grace and mercy.*

This Man can give us His flesh to eat, for the words that He speaketh are spirit and are life.

It is asserted by some, who seem to borrow their arguments from those who know only the Prayer Book of the Church of England, and who do not take the trouble to study their own,

* "As the sun, among the stars, and man, among the sublunary creatures, is the most eminent and noble, the prince of the inferiors, and their measure or their guide: so is this action, among all the instances of religion; it is the most perfect and consummate, it is an union of mysteries, and a consolidation of duties; it joins God and man, and confederates all the societies of men in mutual complexions, and the entertainments of an excellent charity; it actually performs all that could be necessary for man, and it presents to man as great a thing as God could give; for it is impossible anything should be greater than Himself. And when God gave His Son to the world, it could not be but He should give us all things else; and, therefore, this blessed sacrament is a consigning us to all felicities, because, after a mysterious and ineffable manner, we receive Him, Who is light and life, the fountain of grace, and the sanctifier of our secular comforts, and the author of holiness and glory. But as it was at first, so it hath been ever since; "Christ came into the world, and the world knew Him not:" so Christ hath remained in the world, by the communications of this sacrament, and yet He is not rightly understood, and less truly valued. But Christ may say to us, as once to the woman of Samaria, "Woman, if thou didst know the gift of God, and Who it is that speaks to thee, thou wouldst ask Him:" so, if we were so wise, or so fortunate, to know the excellency of this gift of the Lord, it would fill us full of wonder and adoration, joy and thankfulness, great hopes and actual felicities, making us heirs of glory, by the great additions and present increment of grace."—Taylor, *Life of Christ*, Discourse XIX. Works, Vol. 3, p. 289.

that the Holy Eucharist is never called a *Sacrifice* in the service itself. After the words of Institution, after the Oblation, the offering up to the Almighty Father of the holy Gifts, after the Invocation for the descent upon them of the Holy Spirit ; after these come the words (in the same prayer of consecration, and with no interval between them):—

“And we earnestly desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this, our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, (this our Eucharist), most humbly beseeching Thee to grant, that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we, and all Thy whole Church, may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His passion.”

Here is the name at any rate. Now what are the terms employed in the “Oblation?” Before Thy divine Majesty, we celebrate and make the memorial Thy Son commanded. We do this with the holy gifts then offered. These are sacrificial words, used here in a purely technical sense, and come from Leviticus, ii. 2 and 9 ; vi. 15 ; Numbers, v. 26 ; Το *μνημοσυλον*. He, the great High Priest, ever standeth to make intercession for us in heaven, ever offereth up His all-atoning Sacrifice. The priest on earth makes the memorial, that we, one by one, may come and share in that one Sacrifice once offered ; may come and eat that Flesh which is meat indeed, and drink that Blood which is drink indeed ; and which, unless with a true and lively faith, we do eat and drink, our Lord Himself has told us we have no life in us.

In spite of these facts, in spite of the plain structure of the office, there are still some who insist on maintaining that “this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving” means nothing more than the offering to Almighty God of a service of prayer and praise. But this is not so. The language employed is, as said above, strictly technical, that is to say, used in a particular and exclusive sense. It refers and can refer only to the Eucharistic sacrifice: the Body and Blood of the Lord, being now present really, truly, objectively, and spiritually, under the forms of bread and wine, are offered to God, that we (that is, we here present) and all Thy whole Church—*i.e.* the living, and the faithful dead, “the dead in Christ,” whom the Apostle

says, "God will bring with Him," at His second coming—may obtain remission of our sins.*

The expression itself, This our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, occurs for the first time in the First Book of Edward VI., and though not found in any of the Liturgies, was perfectly well known to theologians as a natural and scriptural enlargement of the almost universal *Sacrificium laudis* of the Roman and other missals. St. Augustine says:—

"Quod est sacratius laudis sacrificium quam in actione gratiarum. Et unde majores agendæ sunt Deo gratiæ, quam pro ipsius gratia per Iesum Christum Dominum nostrum, quod totum fideles in Ecclesiæ sacrificio sciunt."†

"The sacrifice of praise" is evidently derived from the sacrificial book of the New Testament, the Epistle to the Hebrews, † ἀναφέρμεν θυσίαν αἰνεώσεως, which itself plainly comes from the Septuagint version of the sacrificial book of the Old Testament, Leviticus. At chapter vii. verses 2, 3, and 5 of this book, we find the words, τῆς θυσίας τῆς αἰνεώσεως, where, says Schleusner, the Scholiast explains αἰνεώσεως by εὐχαριστία. It is found also in 2 Chron. xxix. 31.

Eusebius, about A. D. 330, writes:—

"We sacrifice to the God of all, the sacrifice of praise. We sacrifice the divine, the venerable, the holy Victim. We sacrifice after a new manner, according to the new covenant, the pure sacrifice."§

The phrase appears in the Greek Liturgy of St. James,|| and

* Angels and living saints and dead

But one communion make:

All join in Christ their living Head,

And of His love partake.

Hymn, 184, 5.

† St. Aug. cont. Adver. Leg. et Proph. lib. I. cap. 18, § 37. Op. tom. VIII. col. 568, E.

‡ Chap. xiii. 15.

§ Eusebius Dem. Evan. lib. i. c. 10, quoted in notes to Cosin's Works, vol. 5.

|| The ancient liturgy of Cæsarea reads: "Fit us for this ministry by the power of the Holy Ghost, that we may offer unto Thee the sacrifice of praise." In the Gelasian canon we have, "Remember Thy servants who offer unto Thee this sacrifice of praise for themselves and all theirs." S. Augustine (A. D. 396) writes, "the Church immolates to God a sacrifice of praise in the Body of Christ."

in the present Constantinopolitan Liturgy. It is in the Coptic Liturgy. It is enlarged and altered in the Ethiopic:—

“Et præsta nobis ut offeramus tibi oblationem rationalem, sacrificiumque gratiarum actionis et spirituale.”

In the oldest Sacramentary of the Latin Church, that of S. Leo the Great, it takes a new shape:—

“Suscipe Domine, sacrificium placationis et laudis, quod nos intervenientibus sanctis et perducat ad veniam, et in perpetua gratiarum constituat actione.”*

Such an expansion of the phrase, “sacrifice of praise,” says Scudamore,† applied to the Eucharist from the beginning, is not peculiar to our Liturgy. Witness the Marian Bishop Watson.‡

“Thus doth the Church offer Christ her Head to God the Father, as a worthy sacrifice of praise and thanks.”

The Council of Trent, Canon III. of the twenty-second session, while anathematizing those who say that the Holy Eucharist is *only* a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, by implication acknowledges that title to belong to it. And its catechism uses the same technical expression.

The great commentator, Cornelius a Lapide, says on Hebrews, xiii. 15:—

“Per ipsum ergo, Christum sc., tanquam pontificem et mediatorem nostrum, qui hæc omnia bona nobis conciliavit, quique nostra vota Deo offert, offeramus hostiam laudis, id est sacrificium Missæ, quæ recte dicitur hostia laudis, quia a Christo Domino Deo Patri primum fuit oblata in *gratiarum actionem et laudem*, idemque Christus nobis, ut imitemur, præscripsit et instituit; indeque dicta Eucharistia, id est gratiarum actio. * * * * Hisce ergo hymnis et laudibus semper Deum celebrare debemus, tum privatim, tum publice, præsertim in Missa, quæ, ut recte advertit Galenus, proprie est *sacrificium laudis et gratiarum actionis*.”

The French Church knows of it:—

* S. Leo. ed. Migne, vol. 2, col. 25. Muratorius, Sacramentary, vol. 1. p. 297.

† Notitia Eucharistica, 1st ed., p. 677.

‡ Wholesome and Catholic Doctrine, fol. lxxviii. a.

“Les fideles offrent le sacrifice de louange en s'unissant au Prêtre pour offrir avec lui spirituellement le sacrifice de Jesus Christ, qui est le vraie sacrifice de louange et d'action de graces, le seul capable d'honorer Dieu, et de nous procurer toutes sortes de graces pour le salut.”*

Our own Church writers defend and explain it. Ridley† writes:—

“As though our unbloody sacrifice of the Church were any other than *the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving*, than a commemoration, a showing forth, and a sacramental representation of that one only bloody sacrifice offered up once for all.”

And Bilson‡ says:—

“How the Lord's Supper maie truelie be called an oblation and a sacrifice:—

“The fathers, with one consent, call not your private mass, that they never knewe, but the Lord's Supper a sacrifice, which wee both willingly grant and openly teach: so their text, not your gloze, may prevayle. For there besides the sacrifice of praier and thanksgiving, which wee must then offer to God for our redemption, and other His graces bestowed on us in Christ His Sonne: besides the dedication of our souls and bodies to be a reasonable, quicke, and holy sacrifice to serve and please Him: besides the contribution and almes then given in the primitive Church for the reliefe of the poore and other good uses; a Sacrifice no doubt very acceptable to God: I say besides these three sundry sortes of offerings incident to the Lordes table, the very Supper itselfe is a publike memorial of that great and dreadful Sacrifice, I mean, of the death and blood shedding of our Saviour, and a most assured application of the merites of His passion, for the remission of our sinnes, not to the gazers on, or standers by, but to those that with faith and repentance come to the due receiving of those mysteries.

“There are four kindes of Sacrifices in the Lord's Supper.”

Cosin is very full, and I quote largely from him, as he was the chief mover in the reformation of the English Prayer Book after the great rebellion.

* Explication des Prières, &c., de la Messe. Pierre Le Brun. Tom. I. p. 430.

† Disputation at Oxford, Works, p. 210, Camb., 1841.

‡ p. 689.

"In King Edward's first Service book, this prayer (The Oblation) was set before the delivery of the Sacrament to the people, and followed immediately after the consecration; and certainly it was the better and the more natural order of the two; neither do I know whether it were the printer's negligence, or no, thus to displace it. For the consecration of the Sacrament being ever the first, it was always the use in all liturgies to have the oblation follow (which is this), and then the participation, which goes before, and after all the thanksgiving, which is here set next before the *Gloria in excelsis*: in regard whereof, I have always observed my lord and master Dr. Overall to use this oblation in its right place, when he had consecrated the Sacrament to make an offering of it (as being the true public sacrifice of the Church) unto God, that by the merits of Christ's death, which was now commemorated, all the Church of God might receive mercy, &c., as in this prayer; and when that was done he did communicate the people, and so end with the thanksgiving following hereafter. If men would consider the nature of this Sacrament, how it is the Christian's sacrifice also, they could not choose but use it so too; for as it stands here it is out of his place. We ought first to send up Christ unto God, and then He will send Him down unto us.

This our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. So the ancient fathers were wont to call this sacrifice. *Sacrificium laudis et gratiarum actionis*; not exclusively, as if it were no other sacrifice but that; for they called it also *sacrificium commemorationis*, and *sacrificium spiritus*, and *sacrificium obsequii*, &c., and which is more *sacrificium verum et propitiatorium*. All other ways but this the Eucharist, or any other sacrifice we make, are improperly, *et secundum quandam similitudinem*, called sacrifices. * * * *

Now the Eucharist, though by way of analogy it may be called a sacrifice many of these ways, yet the true and real nature of it, in the offertory, is to acknowledge God's majesty and our misery, and to appease His wrath towards us, to get blessings from Him, to make Christ's bloody sacrifice effectual unto us. * * * *

And so, though it may analogically be called a sacrifice most of the seven ways, yet formally and truly it may be called a sacrifice also, in the very natural signification of a sacrifice, for aught I know any harm should come on't. Not in strictness and rigour of speech; for so was there never sacrifice, nor never shall be any, but Christ's alone. * * * *

That by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church, &c. &c.

This is a plain oblation of Christ's death once offered, and a representative sacrifice of it, for the sins, and for the benefit, of the whole world, of the whole Church; that both those which are here on earth, and those that rest in the sleep of peace, being departed in the faith of Christ, may find the effect and virtue of it. * * *

And in this sense it is not only an eucharistical but a propitiatory, sacrifice. [And to prove it a sacrifice propitiatory, always so acknowledged by the ancient Church, there can be no better argument than that it was offered up, not only for the living but for the dead, and for those that were absent, for them that travelled, for Jews, for heretics, &c., who could have no other benefit of it, but as it was a propitiatory sacrifice: and that thus they did offer it, read a whole army of fathers, * * * *] "not that it makes any propitiation, as that of the cross did, but that it obtains and brings into act, that propitiation which was once made by Christ."*

"True it is that the body and blood of Christ are sacramentally and really (not feignedly) present, when the blessed bread and wine are taken by the faithful communicants. * * * * Therefore, whosoever so receiveth them, at that time when he receiveth them, rightly doth he adore and reverence his Saviour there together with the sacramental bread and cup, exhibiting His own body and blood unto them. Yet because that body and blood is neither sensibly present * * * * the adoration is then and there given to Christ Himself, neither is nor ought to be directed to any external sensible object, such as are the blessed elements. But our kneeling, and the outward gesture of humility and reverence in our bodies, is ordained only to testify and express the inward reverence and devotion of our souls towards our blessed Saviour, who vouchsafed to sacrifice Himself for us upon the cross, and now presenteth Himself to be united sacramentally to us, that we may enjoy all the benefits of His mystical Passion, and be nourished with the spiritual food of His blessed body and blood unto life eternal."†

This our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. That is, this sacrifice of our Eucharist. In which regard, as in divers other besides, the Eucharist may by allusion, analogy, and extrinsical denomination, be fitly called a sacrifice, and the Lord's table an altar; the one relating to the other; though neither of them can be strictly

* Cosin's Works (Anglo-Cath. Lib.) vol. v. pp. 114-120.

† Ibid., p. 345.

and properly so termed. It is the custom of Scripture to describe the service of God under the New Testament, be it either internal or external, by the terms that otherwise most properly belonged to the Old, as immolation, offering, sacrifice, and altar. So the evangelical prophet, Esay, foretelling the glory and amplitude of the Christian Church, speaketh of God's altar that shall be there, upon which an acceptable offering shall be made, ch. ii. 4. &c. And the Apostle, Romans xv. 16, "I labour in the Gospel, that the oblation of the Gentiles may be accepted, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost." And Philippians ii. 17, "The service and sacrifice of your faith." And Hebrews xiii. 10, "We have an altar whereof they (the Jews) are not worthy to eat." And indeed, the Sacrament of the Eucharist carries the name of a sacrifice, and the table whereon it is celebrated an altar of oblation, in a far higher sense than any of their former services did, which were but the types and figures of those services that are performed in recognition and memcry of Christ's own sacrifice, once offered upon the altar of His cross. The prophecy of Malachy, concerning the Church under the New Testament ("My name is great among the gentiles, and they shall offer" or sacrifice "unto Me a pure oblation," Mal. i. 10) applied by the doctors of the Roman Church to their proper sacrifice (as they call it) of the mass, is interpreted and applied by the ancient fathers sometimes in general to all the acts of our Christian religion, and sometimes in particular to the Eucharist; that is the act of our praise and thanksgiving for the sacrifice of Christ once made for us upon the cross (as here we use in the Church of England)."*

Burnet says on Article XXXI. :—

"So in this large sense we do not deny that the Eucharist is a 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving:' and our Church calls it so in the office of the Communion."†

John Gilbert, in his answer to Bossuet, uses the same expression.

"Nevertheless it must be observed, that she (the Church of England) does not stick to call the holy sacrament, 1. A sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving: 2. Yea and to plead before God the merits and death of His Son, that through faith in His blood, we and all His whole Church may obtain remission of sins and all other bene-

* Ibid., p. 347, &c.

† Burnet, 39 Articles, Ed. J. R. Page, 1841, p. 459.

fits of His passion: so that she does not deny it to be after some sort propitiatory. Further, she directs us most fully to render our souls and bodies an acceptable sacrifice to the service of Almighty God.”*

“Therefore as the Israelites worshipped not the wood, nor gold, nor the cherubims that were upon the ark of the testimony, but God alone who promised His presence there, so the adoration which they (the Lutherans) give to Christ in the sacrament is to be understood to be directed to Him only, not at all to the outward elements. * * * * So that there appears a visible and most considerable difference between these two, the one cannot be idolatrous, because it directs not any worship to a creature, the other certainly is if the creatures remain, because their worship is terminated in the sacrament as its object.”†

At the General Convention of 1832, the House of Bishops communicated to the House of Deputies, their reply to the request made to them at the Convention of 1829, in regard to the proper postures to be observed, by priest and people, during the celebration of the Holy Communion. The first section reads:—

“With regard to the officiating priest, they are of opinion that, as the Holy Communion is of a *spiritually sacrificial* character, the standing posture should be observed by him, wherever that of kneeling is not expressly prescribed, to wit: in all parts, including the ante-communion and post-communion, except the confession, and the prayer immediately preceding the prayer of consecration.”‡

The Prayer of Consecration comes to us through Bishop Seabury, from the Scotch Liturgy. The compilers of this

* John Gilbert, of London: *An Answer to the Bishop of Condom* (now of Meaux), His exposition of the Catholic faith, &c., wherein the doctrine of the Church of Rome is detected, and that of the Church of England expressed, from the public acts of both churches. 1686. Philadelphia Library, 949 Q. 4, p. 82.

A copy of this tractate which bears the imprimatur of Archp. Sancroft, will also be found in vol. 29, No. 6, of an exceedingly curious and valuable collection of pamphlets, of about the same date, in some thirty odd small quarto volumes, in the Library of Christ Church, Philadelphia. This collection is probably unique in its way. It is carefully indexed; and with the authors' names written in, where needed.

† *Ibid.*, p. 87.

‡ *Journal* of 1832, p. 82.

Liturgy got it from the Clementine. This latter will be found in English, in the translation of the Apostolic Constitutions, published by Messrs. Clark of Edinburgh in their Ante Nicene Library, Book VIII.; and in the original Greek in Hammond's scholarly publication, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, printed at the Clarendon press in 1878, and will well repay careful study: "any amount of study," Hammond says. "The conclusion," he adds, "which we would commend to our readers is that, taken together with the supplementary account in Book II. of the Apostolical Constitutions, it represents fairly the pre-Constantinian Liturgy of about the middle of the third century." "Its agreement with the Liturgy described by Justin Martyr [A. D. 150] is very remarkable." Justin Martyr, he reminds us, was writing at Rome to Romans, and it is more likely that he would describe a service known to them, than one of a distant province, unless both were the same or nearly so. There are nine points in all which, *in their order*, the Clementine—so called because the Apostolical Constitutions are in their Greek title attributed to St. Clement—corresponds with his. These are, 1. Lectures from the Old and New Testaments. 2. Sermon. 3. Prayers for all estates of men, said by all. 4. The kiss of peace. 5. Oblation of the elements. 6. Thanksgiving. 7. Consecration, with the words of Institution. 8. Intercession. 9. Communion. This Liturgy, if important to the general reader, is all important and interesting to us.

We may regard it as plainly providential that Bishop Seabury received consecration at the hands of the Scotch bishops, and obtained from them the knowledge and the use of their liturgy. With the superiority of which he was so struck that he left nothing undone to persuade our fathers to accept and adopt from it certain very important additions and alterations. What an incredible step was it, from the Proposed Book, to the Book we now have! For the rejection of the one, and the acceptance of the other how can we be too thankful? For the one we may thank the conservatism of the people: for the other the wisdom and catholicity of Bishop Seabury.

The martyred Laud's share in the Scotch Liturgy seems to be misunderstood, if we may believe his own account. I copy

from the preface to Keeling's valuable book "The several editions of the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England &c. &c. &c." an extract from "The History of the troubles and trial of Archbishop Laud. Wrote by himself during his imprisonment in the tower."

Upon the application, says Keeling, of the Bishops of Scotland for a Liturgy for that church, it was the opinion of Archp. Laud (to use his own words) that, "if his majesty would have a Liturgy settled there, it were best to take the English Liturgy without any variation, that so the same Service-book might be established in all his majesty's dominions. * * * * His majesty inclined to my opinion, to have the English Service without any alteration to be established there; and in this condition I held that business for two, if not three, years at least. Afterwards, the Scottish bishops still pressing his majesty that a Liturgy framed by themselves, and in some few things different from ours, would relish better with their countrymen, they at last prevailed with his majesty to have it so, and carried it against me, notwithstanding all I could say or do to the contrary. Then his majesty commanded me to give the bishops of Scotland my best assistance in this way and work. I delayed as much as I could with my obedience; and when nothing would serve but it must go on, I confess I was then very serious, and gave them the best help I could."

Bishop Seabury's Communion Office has been reprinted with a valuable Historical Sketch and notes by the Rev. Samuel Hart. New York, 1874.

"In the service for the administration of the Communion," says Bp. White,* "it may perhaps be expected, that the great change made, in restoring to the consecration prayer the oblatory words and the invocation of the Holy Spirit, left out in king Edward's reign, must at least have produced an opposition. But no such thing happened to any considerable extent; or at least, the author did not hear of any in the other house, further than a disposition to the effect in a few gentlemen, which was counteracted by some pertinent remarks of the president (Dr. William Smith). In that of the bishops, it lay very near to the heart of Bp. Seabury. As for the other bishop, without conceiving with some, that the service as it stood was essentially defective, he always thought there was

* Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 2d edition, page 154.

a beauty in those ancient forms, and can discover no superstition in them."

The prayer of consecration in the so called Clementine Liturgy is as follows; and is given here for convenience of comparison with our own. The resemblance is very marked, and especially so in the sequence of the parts, the words of Institution, the Oblation, the Invocation of the Holy Spirit.

"For in the same night that He was betrayed, He took bread in His holy and undefiled hands, and looking up to Thee His God and Father, He brake it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, This is the mystery of the new covenant: take of it and eat. This is My body, which is broken for many, for the remission of sins. In like manner also He took the cup, and mixed it of wine and water, and sanctified it, and delivered it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this: for this is My blood which is shed for many, for the remission of sins: do this in remembrance of Me. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show forth My death until I come. Being mindful, therefore of His passion, and death, and resurrection from the dead, and return into the heavens, and His future second appearing, wherein He is to come with glory and power to judge the quick and the dead, and to recompense to every one according to his works, we offer to Thee, our King, and our God, according to His constitution, this bread and this cup, giving Thee thanks, through Him, that Thou hast thought us worthy to stand before Thee, and to sacrifice to Thee; and we beseech Thee that Thou wilt mercifully look down upon these gifts which are here set before Thee, O Thou God, Who standest in need of none of our offerings. And do Thou accept them to the honour of Thy Christ, and send down upon this sacrifice Thine Holy Spirit, the Witness of the Lord Jesus' sufferings, that He may show this bread to be the body of Thy Christ, and the cup to be the blood of Thy Christ, that those who are partakers thereof may be strengthened for piety, may obtain the remission of their sins, may be delivered from the devil and his deceit, may be filled with the Holy Ghost, may be made worthy of Thy Christ, and may obtain eternal life upon Thy reconciliation to them, O Lord Almighty."*

It is a very thoughtful remark of Mr. Hammond, and one of deep import and worthy of our careful consideration, that

* The Apostolic Constitutions, Book VIII. page 231.

the idea of *time* is excluded from the divine liturgy. His words are, and the capitals are his own:—

“On what principle is the Great Intercession, for instance, placed now after, now before, and now in the midst of the consecration; now partly before and partly after; and lastly, wholly away from the consecration and in connection with the Offertory? Is it not that, as it is in heaven, so when here a heavenly mystery is being enacted, **THE ELEMENT OF TIME MUST BE CONSIDERED TO BE EXCLUDED?** Of course human actions and human speech are subject to the condition of time, and hence the various actions of the service and the Prayers and Hymns must follow each other in some order: but we venture to suggest that a true view of the Eucharist service, at least of the ‘*Missa Fidelium*,’ can only be gained by looking at it as a whole, as one great act of Eucharistic sacrifice (*θυσία αἰνέσεως*, Hebrews, xiii. 15), wherein, as far as possible, we are transferred into the atmosphere of heaven, ‘made to sit in heavenly places,’ and absorbed in an ever-biding present.”*

To finish this part of our subject, we have only now to consider the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which the Article declares repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, and overthrowing the nature of a Sacrament. Transubstantiation is defined to be the change of the substance of bread and wine. For the meaning of the word sacrament, we must turn to the Catechism,† where alone, unless I mistake, do we find in our formularies, an exposition of what the Protestant Episcopal Church intends by it: “An outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us; a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof.” What

* C. E. Hammond. *Liturgies, Eastern and Western*. page xxxvii.

† Hac pariter de causa Christus voluit in V. Eucharistiæ Sacramento jugiter manere in Ecclesia, imo in ecclesiis omnibus et singulis usque ad finem mundi. Sicut enim Christi humanitas et deitas gloriosa est cælo, adoraturque visibiliter ab Angelis et sanctis, sic eadem est in Eucharistia, sed occultata sub speciebus panis et vini, ideoque invisibilis, ibique adoratur, imo manducatur à fidelibus, ut eorum animabus omne id præstet, quod panis et vinum præstat corporibus, puta omne nutrimentum, omnem vigorem, omne robur, omnem suavitatem, omnes delicias, omne gaudium. Quocirca Christus est, qui per singulos sacerdotes dum celebrant, facit quotidie miraculum miracu-

do you mean by Substance? Taking that word as our formularies do, of course all that they say about Transubstantiation is true. But the defenders of this doctrine deny our meaning of the term Substance. We may leave it to the theologians.

Hooker himself asserts that plain people have nothing to do with these philosophical subtleties. His words are:—

“The fruit of the Eucharist is the participation of the body and blood of Christ. There is no sentence of Holy Scripture which saith that we cannot by this sacrament be made partakers of His body and blood, except they be first contained in the sacrament or the sacrament converted into them. ‘This is My body,’ and ‘This is My blood,’ being words of promise, sith we all agree that by the sacrament Christ doth really and truly in us perform His promise, why do we vainly trouble ourselves with so fierce contentions whether by consubstantiation, or else by transubstantiation the sacrament itself be first possessed with Christ or no? A thing which no way can either further or hinder us howsoever it stand, because our participation of Christ in this sacrament dependeth on the co-operation of His omnipotent power, which maketh it His body and blood to us, whether with change or without alteration of the element such as they imagine, we need not greatly to care nor enquire.”*

Burnet, who belongs to a very different school, says as much:—

“All opinions that do not break in upon these, are things in which great forbearance is to be used; large allowances are to be made for men’s notions in all other things; and therefore we think that neither *consubstantiation* nor *transubstantiation*, how ill-grounded soever we take both to be, ought to dissolve the union and communion of churches; but it is quite another thing, if under

lorum; nimirum admirabilem illam conversionem panis et vini in corpus et sanguinem suum, quam Theologi vocant transubstantionem: hanc enim nec homo, nec angelus, nec vis creata efficere posset. Ipse ergo etiamnum actu est sacerdos, dum per sacerdotes singulares Eucharistiam conficit, seque in ea Deo Patri quasi incruentam Victimam in holocaustum offert.—CORNELIUS A LAPIDE. In Matthæum, xxviii. 20. Sub fine.

Bishop Overall, when he wrote the last part of our Catechism, and Cornelius, when he wrote the above, had they before them the same original from which both derived identical ideas and words?

* Hooker’s Works, ed. Keble, vol. 2, p. 353. Eccles. Polity, V. ch. lxvii. 6.

either of these opinions an adoration of the elements is taught and practised.”*

To me it has always seemed as if trying to be wise above what is written, when we attempt to give the *how* of any of the mysteries God has revealed to us. That they *are* should content us. How, by what means, they are, we can never here know.

“State contenti, umana gente, al *quía*.”

The doctrine of our church is so well set forth in one of the sermons of Bishop Andrews on “The Nativity,” that I shall give rather a lengthy quotation from it. It was preached on Christmas Day, 1623. The text is from Ephesians i. 10. “That in the dispensation of the fulness of times He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in Him.”

“We shall the better dispense the season, if we gather to prayers, to God’s word; if we begin with them, if with the dispensation of His holy mysteries gather to that specially.

“For there we do not gather to Christ or of Christ, but we gather Christ Himself; and gathering Him we shall gather the tree and fruit and all upon it. For as there is a recapitulation of all in heaven and earth in Christ, so there is a recapitulation of all in Christ in the Holy Sacrament. You may see it clearly: there is in Christ the Word eternal for things in heaven; there is also flesh for things on earth. Semblably, the Sacrament consisteth of a heavenly and of a terrene part (it is Irenæus’s own words); the heavenly—there the Word too, the abstract of the other; the earthly—the element.

“And in the elements, you may observe there is a fulness of the seasons of the natural year; of the corn-flour or harvest in the one, bread; of the wine-press or vintage in the other, wine. And in the heavenly, of the ‘wheat-corn,’ whereto He compareth Himself—bread, even the living Bread (or ‘Bread of Life’) ‘that came down from heaven;’ the true manna, whereof we may gather each his gomer. And again of Him, the true Vine, as He calls Himself—the blood of the grapes of that vine. Both these issuing out of this day’s recapitulation, both in ‘a body Thou hast fitted Me’ of this day.†

* Burnet on 39 Articles, Art. XXVIII. p. 445.

† Hebrews x. 5, marginal reading.

"And the gathering or vintage of these two in the blessed Eucharist, is, as I may say, a kind of hypostatical union of the sign and the thing signified, so united together as are the two natures of Christ. And even from this sacramental union do the Fathers borrow their resemblance, to illustrate by it the personal union in Christ; I name Theodoret for the Greek, and Gelasius for the Latin Church, that insist upon it both, and press it against Eutyches. That even as in the Eucharist neither part is evacuate or turned into the other, but abide each still in his former nature and substance, no more is either of Christ's natures annulled, or one of them converted into the other, as Eutyches held; but each nature remaineth still full and whole in His own kind. And backwards; as the two natures in Christ, so the *signum* and *signatum* in the Sacrament, *e converso*. And this latter device, of the substance of the bread and wine to be flown away and gone, and in the room of it a remainder of nothing else but accidents to stay behind, was to them not known, and had it been true, had made for Eutyches, and against them. And this for the likeness of the union in both.

"Now for the word 'gathering together in one.' It is well known the Holy Eucharist itself is called *Synaxis*, by no name more usual in all antiquity, that is a 'collection or gathering.' For so it is in itself; for at the celebration of it, though we gather to prayer and to preaching, yet that is the principal gathering the Church hath, which is itself called a 'collection' too by the same name from the chief; for 'where the body is there the eagles will be gathered,' and so one *Synaxis* begets another.

"And last, there is a 'dispensation'—that word in it too, that most clearly. For it is our office, we are styled by the Apostle 'dispensers of the mysteries of God;' and in and by them, of all the benefits that came to mankind by this dispensation in the fulness of season of all that are recapitulate in Christ.

"Which benefits are too many to deal with. One shall serve as the sum of all; that the very end of the Sacrament is to gather again to God and His favor, if it happen, as oft it doth, we scatter and stray from Him. And to gather us as close and near as *alimentum alito* (nourishment to the one nourished), that is as near as near may be.

"And as to gather us to God, so likewise each to other mutually; expressed lively in the symbols of many grains into the one, and many grapes into the other. The Apostle is plain that we are all 'one bread and one body, so many as are partakers of one bread,'

so moulding us as it were into one loaf altogether. The gathering to God refers still to things in heaven, this other to men, to the things in earth here. All under one head by the common faith; all into one body mystical by mutual charity. So shall we well enter into the dispensing of this season, to begin with.

“And even thus to be recollected at this feast by the Holy Communion into that blessed union, is the highest perfection we can in this life aspire unto. We then are at the highest pitch, at the very best we shall ever attain to on earth, what time we newly come from it; gathered to Christ, and by Christ to God; stated in all whatsoever He hath gathered and laid up against His next coming. With which gathering here in this world we must content and stay ourselves, and wait for the consummation of all at His coming again.”

AURICULAR CONFESSION.

The other matter to be looked into is “Auricular Confession.” This we are told is un-Protestant practice. Is the trouble with *auricular*, or with *confession*? Auricular is a harmless word enough, and comes, I suppose from the Latin word *auricula*, meaning an ear. Confession is to tell something; and, provided you have all your senses, what other way do you tell anything but into the ear of the listener? Certainly, if you have a confession of some weighty matter to make, weighty to you at any rate, you do not go out into the public streets, and gather a crowd around you, and then and there proclaim aloud your trouble. You take your friend aside, and you pour into his sympathizing ear your grief, or your sorrow, or your sin. If you are a physician, or if you are a lawyer, you are constantly called upon to hear secrets, which if bruited abroad would affect the happiness, the well doing, the standing of others. Do not the physicians and the lawyers hold what is thus communicated to them as sacred, as not to be made known? Certainly they do. And are clergymen, who by their office are the physicians of souls, who have to deal with sin and with shame, are they to be faulted and held up to public odium, for doing precisely what their brethren of the other professions do? We all know better. We all know,

that at the sacrifice of liberty or life, they must hold inviolate the trust committed to them.

What have our formularies to say? When the minister giveth warning of the celebration of the Holy Communion, he says,

“And because it is requisite that no man should come to the Holy Communion; but with a full trust in God’s mercy, and with a quiet conscience; therefore, if there be any of you, who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel; let him come to me, or to some other Minister of God’s word, and open his grief.”

Let him come to me, or to some other minister of God’s word, and open his grief. This is auricular confession. It is here urged upon every one that feels the need of it. It is not allowed, or tolerated, but urged, urged very solemnly, very deliberately, and for a very important purpose.

In the Visitation of the sick, the rubric requires the minister to examine whether the patient repent him truly of all his sins. This has the appearance of auricular confession at any rate.

And in the Visitation of prisoners is this rubric:—

“Then shall the Minister examine whether he repent him truly of his sins, and be in charity with all the world, and further admonish him particularly concerning the crimes wherewith he is charged; and exhort him, if he have any scruples, that he would declare the same, and prepare himself for the Holy Communion, against the time that it may be proper to administer it to him.”

In the exhortation which the Minister is required to make “when a criminal is under sentence of death” is the following passage:—

“Since therefore you are soon to pass into an endless and unchangeable state, and your future happiness or misery depends upon the few moments which are left you; I require you strictly to examine yourself, and your estate both towards God and towards man; and let no worldly consideration hinder you from making a true and full confession of your sins, and giving all the satisfaction which is in your power to every one whom you have wronged or injured, that you may find mercy at your heavenly Father’s hand, for Christ’s sake, and not be condemned in the dreadful day of judgment.”

What can the words of warning "let no worldly consideration hinder you from making a true and full confession of your sins" mean, but that he may rest assured of the sanctity of the seal. What other *worldly consideration* could there be for one so soon to pass from the seen to the unseen. Surely none at all. He needs only to be assured that all he says will remain a sacred deposit in the breast of his spiritual adviser. He is pleaded with, to put away all doubts on that subject, and to avail himself fully and freely of the ministry of grace, and love, and pardon. Time is very short, and an eternity may depend upon the use of the few moments left him. The words of the exhortation are earnest, and full of meaning, they are not words of course, without pith and substance.

And still further on these two rubrics:—

"Then shall the Minister examine whether he repent him truly of his sins, exhorting him to a particular confession of the sin for which he is condemned, and upon Confession, he shall instruct him what satisfaction ought to be made to those whom he has offended thereby, and if he knoweth any combinations in wickedness, or any evil practices designed against others, let him be admonished to the utmost of his power to discover and prevent them."

"After his Confession, the Priest shall declare to him the pardoning mercy of God, in the Form which is used in the Communion Service."

Here the minister is required to exhort to a particular confession of his sin, to instruct him to make such *amends* as are in his power, and to admonish him to make public what he knows is in contemplation that may injure others. After his confession, he is to receive absolution. This is private absolution, after auricular confession.

In the Form and Manner of Ordering Priests, set forth by authority in 1792, and still unchanged, the Bishop says, laying his hands on the candidate, who is "humbly kneeling,"

"Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands; whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained: And be thou a faithful Dispenser of the word of God, and of his holy Sacraments: In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

The power of absolution is here given. Can it only be exercised in public, or when a criminal is visited in prison and is comforted? To state the question is to answer it.

The thirty-fifth Article of Religion is of the Homilies, and is taken verbatim from the English Articles, a note being appended. The beginning of this note is, "This article is received in this Church, so far as it declares the Books of Homilies to be an explication of Christian doctrine, and instructive in piety and morals." The Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments asserts that "Absolution *hath* the promise of forgiveness of sin":—

"For although absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sin, yet by the express word of the New Testament, it hath not this promise annexed and tied to the visible sign, which is imposition of hands. For this visible sign (I mean laying on of hands) is not expressly commanded in the New Testament to be used in absolution, as the visible signs in Baptism and the Lord's Supper are; and therefore absolution is *no such sacrament* as Baptism and the Communion are."*

And in the same second Book of Homilies is this passage on Repentance:—

"I do not say but that, if any do find themselves troubled in conscience, they may repair to their learned curate or pastor, or to some other godly learned man, and show the trouble and doubt of their conscience to them, that they may receive *at* their hands the comfortable salve of God's word; but it is against the true Christian liberty, that any man should be bound to the numbering of his sins."†

When, after the revolution, our clergy and laity met together and applied to the mother Church for the episcopate, the English bishops showed themselves very willing to comply with this reasonable request, but on having laid before them a draft of the proposed alterations in the Book of Common Prayer, drew back in some haste and astonishment. It was not until their fears were allayed and their suspicions removed, by the restoration of certain of the omissions, and by the strong and fervent assertion of our Convention, that no

* Homilies, p. 316.

† Ibid., p. 481.

change of doctrine was either intended or desired, that they consented to act, and to give us the asked for boon.

The Preface to our Prayer Book contains accordingly, in an often-quoted passage, an expression of this determination of not departing from the English Church :—

“ In which it will also appear that this Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship; or further than local circumstances require.”

It is not to be denied that our ancestors did hide, more than they ought to have done, the essential doctrine of confession and absolution. They did put it out of sight, as it were, partly through ignorance, partly for fear of popular clamor. But they did not do away with it. They reaffirmed emphatically the Homilies, just quoted from, which declare that *absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sin*. They took care that the power of conferring this blessing should be clearly stated in the Ordinal as bestowed upon the priest; and it may be remarked, by the way, that whether the one or the other form is used makes no difference, the intention is all. And they fixed an extreme case where they ordered it to be used, and thereby included all lesser cases.

But granting this unfortunate concealment, still as they declare that they are far from intending to depart from the doctrine or discipline of the English Church, they must be believed and held to speak the truth. And, therefore, whatever is the doctrine of the Church of England is the doctrine of our Church. And we have a full right to use all English authors as our own. It ought to be needless to make this statement, so plainly is it the fact, that our Church is certainly one with the Church of England, and this has always been acted on by us. But it has recently been, seemingly, denied, though in an irresolute and doubtful manner, and therefore needs to be re-asserted positively, as beyond all question.*

* See also the second address to the English prelates from the Convention of 1786, dated Christ Church, Philadelphia, June 26.

“ While doubts remain of our continuing to hold the same essential articles of faith and discipline with the Church of England, we acknowledge the propriety of suspending a compliance with our request.

And, furthermore, the present Church of England is one constitutionally and organically with the church that Augustine, sent on his mission of love by Gregory the Great, founded in the year 597 at St. Martin's, Canterbury.

"The historical fact cannot be altered to please any man. The Church of England is the daughter of the Church of Rome. She is so, perhaps, more directly than any other church in Europe."*

Her connection with the Catholic Church was not broken at the Reformation.

"The Reformers secured the oneness of the Modern with the Mediæval Church of England by preserving the continuity of its organization by unbroken ties of holy orders, by innumerable traditions of thought and sentiment, of faith, of feeling and of ritual, such especially as the Prayer Book has retained in common with the service-books of other churches."†

Some doctrines were reformed, but only because they did not conform to the Catholic rule, "*Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus.*" Things which were truly ancient and catholic were retained. In the first Reformed Prayer Book of 1549, we have the order for the Holy Communion, "commonly called the mass," the ancient vestments are continued, exorcism is used in Baptism, the sick are anointed, and provision is made for a celebration of the Holy Communion at the burial of the dead. As Hardwick truly says:—

"The animus of that service book was primitive and even mediæval, very much of the material was drawn directly from the older offices, and in the portions where new elements of thought are visible, the sources which supplied them were the Breviary of Cardinal

"We are unanimous and explicit in assuring your lordships that we neither have departed, nor propose to depart from the doctrines of your Church. We have retained the same discipline and forms of worship, as far as was consistent with our civil constitutions; and we have made no alterations or omissions in the Book of Common Prayer but such as that consideration prescribed, and such as were calculated to remove objections which it appeared to us more conducive to union and general content to obviate than to dispute."¹

* E. A. Freeman in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9th edition, vol. viii. p. 278.

† Hardwick's *Reformation*, p. 170, 5th edition.

¹ *Journals of the General Convention*. Reprint of 1861, vol. i. page 44.

Quignones (1536) recommended by Pope Paul III., and still more, the Consultation of Archbishop Herman, of Cologne.”*

The second reformed book of 1552 made other and more radical reforms, at the instigation of such an extreme man as Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester, and the foreigners, John a Lasco, Pullain, Peter Martyr, and Bucer. But it must be remembered that this was only a concession of the strong to the weak. The second Act of Uniformity referred to the Book of 1549 as a “very godly order. * * * * agreeable to the Word of God, and the primitive Church, very comfortable to all good people;” and admitted that “in the use and exercise of the Book of 1549, divers doubts had arisen, ‘rather by the curiosity of the minister and mistakers than of any other worthy cause.’”

In 1559 the Prayer Book was again revised, and the changes were in the direction of the first book of Edward, not the second. The “Ornaments” rubric was introduced before the order for Morning Prayer, which legalized the use of lights and vestments, and all other ornaments authorized by Parliament in the second year of Edward VI., which it is important to remember is the year before the adoption of the Prayer Book of 1549, which was “imprinted at London the 16 day of March in the third year of the reign of our sovereign lord King Edward VI.”

In the revision of 1662, which gave us the Prayer Book, substantially as we have it now, no regard was paid to the innumerable objections of the Puritans, but many changes were introduced in the way of getting back to more ancient usage. In 1689 a strong effort was made to revise the Prayer Book in the interest of Puritanism. But it failed completely, as all like efforts have since failed, both in England and in the United States.

In all these changes the historical continuity of the Church has never been broken, and though in some matters she has made reforms which, as an autonomous church she had full right to do, as she saw need, the faith of the English Church (and of our own) is the faith of the pre-reformation Church,

* Ibid., page 198.

and one with that of the primitive, Catholic Church, and *therefore* binding on our hearts and consciences.

Abuse to-day of the Caroline divines, the very men who gave us the present English Prayer Book, sounds like the far off, faint, and feeble echo of ancient Puritan prejudice. They who indulge in it forget that between Elizabeth's book of 1559 and Charles's book of 1662, there intervened the civil war, the martyrdom of the great archbishop, and the expulsion from their homes of six thousand devoted priests and bishops, pastors of Christ's flock, learned, industrious, sober minded men—men driven to beg their bread on the highway, or to eat their meagre pittance, seasoned with the bitter salt of exile, in a strange and foreign land. Of the two thousand interlopers, who in their turn were sent away, we hear enough, but of these six thousand, driven out with their wives and children, with contumely and oaths, there is silence mute as the grave.*

Laudation of the reformers, at the expense of their far more learned, far more able, far more holy, and more really independent and fearless successors, looks like a wilful ignorance of all the facts that the diligent researches of the able scholars of this century have brought to light. I do not say that it is wilful, but it is strangely unfortunate, misleading, and harmful.

To whom have Churchmen really looked for guidance, for instruction, and for help? Not to Cranmer, or Latimer, or Ridley, or those who immediately succeeded them, but to Sutton, to Taylor, to Wilson; to Pearson, to Bull, to Butler; to Herbert, to Nelson, to Keble. Sutton's "Godly Meditations," Bishop Taylor's "Holy Living and Dying," Bishop Wilson's "Sacra Privata," have been household books for generation after generation. Bishop Pearson, the greatest name in English theology (as Bishop Henry Phillpotts calls him), has he not always taught, and does he not still teach,

* Concerning whom read: "An attempt towards recovering an account of the numbers and sufferings of the Clergy of the Church of England, in the time of the Grand Rebellion." By John Walker, 1714. Philadelphia Library, 792 F.

our clergy of every shade of opinion, and all laymen of any reading, in his masterpiece on the Creed? Bishop Butler, by his "Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed," has been the instructor of all, young and old, women as well as men, since its first appearance. All Christians, of all opinions, read, study, and wonder at it. Bishop Bull's "Defence of the Nicene Creed" is our great text-book, and won him the lasting praise of all believers. Robert Nelson's "Festivals and Fasts," catching inspiration from George Herbert's "Temple" kept alive the flame of devotion, the knowledge of the old paths, the trust in one ever present, ever helping God, through the dead and dreary eighteenth century, that truly dark age of the Church, a darkness which culminated in the lurid light of the first French revolution, and the harlot standing, as the goddess of reason, on the high altar of *Notre Dame*. They kept hope alive, and handed down their treasure to John Keble, who in his *Christian Year* has now for fifty years brought weary souls to Christ, and given them trust and consolation in their sorrow and wretchedness. John Keble, on whom the English Church has set her stamp, more than on any other man since Henry the Eighth's days. And whose memory, friend and foe delighted to honor, at the consecration of the chapel, the completion of the college, that bear his much-loved name.

No one may take from us our inheritance. No one may separate us from the past. The saints of all ages are our own. Whether they were "destitute, afflicted, tormented, of whom the world was not worthy," or whether "out of weakness, they were made strong," and conquered the earth, all are our own. Their lives are our examples. Their labors move our emulation. Their devotion to Christ, our Lord, stimulates our devotion to that one and only Saviour. Their faith is our faith; their hope our hope; their love our love.

No one may separate us from the present. The Prayer Book knows of no limit of diocese, or State, or Country. In Baptism we are grafted into Christ's Church. Twice a day we stand, to avow that we believe one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. Twice a day we kneel, to pray, more especially, for God's holy Church universal. In the Holy Communion

we pray for that same universal Church. In the Visitation of the sick, we entreat that we may die in the communion of that Catholic Church. In the Ember weeks, we address ourselves to Almighty God, our heavenly Father, Who hath purchased, to Himself, that universal Church. And our deacons, priests, and bishops, are made, ordered, and consecrated, deacons, priests, and bishops of the Church of God.

Our connection with this universal Church is through our own Church, but our own Church is not the whole Church, as some would fain have us to think, but is a constituent portion of that one universal Church, to which ultimately our allegiance, primarily due to her, is alone owed. Neither does our Church lay claim to the attribute of infallibility herself, while denying it to the churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome. While our sympathies, our affections are first with her, she does not ask us to confine them to her, but bids us let them go out through all the earth, to all the children of God, to the whole of Israel; nay, beyond also, to all Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics, that they may be brought home, home to the fold of Christ—their Lord and ours.

Who shall separate us from the future, if we but hold fast the confidence and rejoicing of hope firm unto the end? For Christ, once offered to bear the sins of many, shall appear, unto them that look for Him, the second time, without sin, unto salvation.

To Whom be all glory for ever.

Amen.

APPENDIX.

It is not pretended to claim that all the writers who are quoted below held the same views on the Holy Eucharist as those set forth in this pamphlet. Nor that they always spoke as clearly and satisfactorily even, as they do in the passages given. They are, many of them, verbose and cloudy writers, whose own ideas not being at all precise, their expression of them could not choose but be vague and feeble. But not one of them held the views which are now held by those who call themselves extreme low churchmen or evangelicals. It was reserved for this age, said one to me the other day, it was reserved for this age to hold and to teach the real *absence* of Christ in the holy Eucharist.

It is, indeed, sad to think that any among us should work and labour to be rid of, what they call, sacramentarianism—a name which by the way has changed its meaning absolutely since Hooker's days, signifying now the direct opposite of what it did then—and place their whole hope of the future of our church, in the success of such effort. There is not one of these writers given by me and appealed to by them, who does not believe that something very great, something very real, something precious beyond words, is given to the devout receiver in the Lord's supper.

It being impossible in the space at my disposal to adduce the testimony of more than a very few of the great multitude of English divines, it was necessary to make a choice. I give therefore Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, and their immediate successors;* and these latter men, because they have lately been held up to our admiration, though many of them, it had been far wiser, to have left in the obscurity into which they had fallen. There are added certain others whose views have been not only questioned, but claimed to be just what they are

* Parker, Barlow, Cox, Grindal, Parkhurst, Scambler, Jewel, Horne, Sandys, and Pilkington. Becon.

not;* and also some others whose opinions are of weight, and have always been thought to be so.†

A very large space is devoted to Richard Montague, and an attempt made to clear his good name from needless and unjust aspersions. This seemed incumbent upon me, since by occasion of my mention of him, the singularly unbecoming and misplaced epithet of *infamous* has been bestowed upon the illustrious dead, and the assertion hazarded that I withheld what I knew of him, and that anyhow high churchmen would not thank me for making him their champion. In what follows I have not only gathered all I could about him, from his contemporaries and his own writings, but I think I have got to the bottom of a great fraud, upon which more than one prominent writer has built, at the cost of truth, justice, and right.

Where the writers brought forward have left anything on either subject, the holy Eucharist, or Confession, I have endeavoured to give it, always going to the original sources, and using the old editions when they could be as conveniently had.

This field has already been partly and ably covered by one who has given the information asked for, perhaps more than was asked for, certainly more, by a good deal, than was expected or looked for. But it has been thought better, at the risk of seeming to tread over trodden ground, to keep to the original plan and to give all the authorities; and some of them in a much enlarged and more complete form than has heretofore been done.

I will only add that nearly all the authors quoted are on my shelves; and those not there are in the Philadelphia Library; so that any one wishing to verify the quotations for himself, can easily do so.

NOTE.—It is rather amusing to find an anonymous writer holding up to public scorn and execration two laymen, for daring to study the Bible, the Prayer Book, and ancient and modern divines, for themselves, and to have, and to give utterance to, their own opinions about them, and asserting, in the roundest terms, that it is the duty of all laymen to sit at the feet of him

* Whitgift, Hooker, Hall, Wake, Butler, Bingham.

† Taylor, Mede, Forbes, Bramhall.

The venerable Dr. Pusey published last year a translation of the Abbé Gaume's Manual for Confessors, abridged and adapted for the use of the English Church. An extremely valuable preface accompanies the work, which after some remarks on the general subject, endeavours to show by extracts from writers of all schools, from the days of the reformers to our own, that the practice of confession not only has never ceased in the Church of England, but that its benefits, and its necessity in certain cases, have been constantly and consistently taught.

This preface is important to be read by all who wish to know what the church really holds, and what her great divines have really taught on this all-important matter. Have we, or have we not, the right, in hours of sorrow, doubt, or anguish, to go to the godly and well-learned minister of Christ, unburden ourselves to him, and receive at his hands guidance, comfort, help, consolation?

Certainly confession had fallen into abeyance. One generation after another had passed away, both of clergy and laymen, who knew not its use. And what was the consequence? Dr. Pusey says:—

“It was a prevailing habit, somewhat more than forty years ago, to speak lightly of sins committed before any one's conversion or marriage, when sins were broken off or the temptation to them ceased. The popular doctrine was what John Keble called the doctrine of Protestantism, ‘every man his own absolver,’ and since we are mostly on easy terms with ourselves, the terms of self-absolution were commonly very easy. It was a quiet easy-going time, and so repentance partook of the general easiness. There was apparently little memory of past deadly sin, except an occasional thankfulness that any one was no longer guilty of it. Abiding

who is appointed over them, and to learn from his lips, and from them only, the words of truth and life. He says, that these two laymen attempt to inform and teach “Two godly and well-learned Priests and Pastors of ‘Christ's Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church,’ solemnly ordained by imposition of hands, and commanded ‘Go teach’—‘Go preach’—in the proper vestments of their Holy office.”

Risum teneatis amici?

And yet one of these laymen only answered questions propounded by a divine to a layman, and the other addressed himself solely to the people, and did not at all propose to teach the clergy.

sorrow even for deadly and forgiven sin certainly was not part of their teaching. There was not even the 'would God I had never been such,' which St. Augustine uses of the sins, into which he fell, when he was unbaptized and so not yet a member of Christ."*

Yet this dreadful condition of soul, there are some now among us here who advocate and glorify, as what is genuine godliness, and true spirituality. They deem darkness to be light; and living in this great war of ignorance; these so great plagues, call they peace.

It is a gleam of sunshine in our night to learn that the study of Casuistry has been introduced into one of our divinity schools; and that hereafter Bishop Wordsworth's excellent translation of his great predecessor, Robert Sanderson's classical work on the Conscience, will form one of their regular textbooks. Once again Connecticut, mindful of her first bishop, of happy memory, takes the lead, and makes a stride onward, in our certain return, to Catholicity, true wisdom, and common sense.

CONFESSION.

At pages 35 and 36 of his preface, Dr. Pusey quotes these words of CRANMER, appended in his own handwriting to the draught of "The Articles of the German Reformers" corrected by him:—

"So that he whose conscience is afflicted for one or many sins ought to seek from the priest consolation, counsel, and absolution for each in particular, and not to neglect a thing so salutary."

And this extract from Cranmer's Catechism, written, as he says, by himself:—

"God dothe not speake to us with a voyce soundynge out of heaven. But He hath given the kayes of the kingdom of heaven, and the authoritie to forgive sinne, to the ministers of the Church. Wherefore let him that is a sinner go to one of them, let him knowledge and confesse his synne, and praye him that, according to God's commandente, he will gyve him absolution, and comfort him with the word of grace and forgiveness of his synnes. And when the minister doth so, then I ought stedfastly to believe that my synnes are truly forgiven me in heaven."

* Page v.

From Bishop LATIMER, he quotes the following from the close of his sermon on the 3d Sunday after the Epiphany:*

"But to speak of right and true confession, I would to God it were kept in England; for it is a good thing. And those which find themselves grieved in conscience might go to a learned man, and there fetch of him comfort of the Word of God, and so come to a quiet conscience * * * * and sure it grieveth me much that such confessions are not kept in England."

And from Bishop RIDLEY this passage from a letter to West, one time his Chaplain, but who "conformed" in Mary's reign and shortly after died:—†

"You have known me long indeed in the which time it has chanced me, as you say, to mislike some things. It is true, I grant; for sudden changes without substantial and necessary cause, and the heady setting forth of extremities, I did never love. Confession unto the minister, which is able to instruct, correct, comfort, and inform the weak, wounded, and ignorant conscience, indeed I ever thought might do much good to Christ's congregation, and so I assure you, I think even at this day."

HOLY EUCHARIST.

"But here you take such a large scope that you flee from the four proper matters that be in controversy, unto a new scope devised by you, that I should absolutely deny the presence of Christ, and say that the bread doth only signify Christ's body absent; which thing I never said nor thought. And as Christ saith not so, nor Paul saith not so, even so likewise I say not so; and my book in divers places saith clean contrary, that Christ is with us spiritually present, is eaten and drunken of us, and dwelleth within us, although corporally he be departed out of this world, and is ascended up into heaven."‡

"God grant that, all contention set aside, both the parties may come to this holy communion with such a lively faith in Christ, and such an unfeigned love to all Christ's members, that, as they carnally eat with their mouths this sacramental bread, and drink the wine, so spiritually they may eat and drink the very flesh and

* See "Remains," Parker Society, p. 186.

† See Works, Parker Society, p. 338.

‡ Cranmer, Answer to Gardiner, Parker Soc. ed., p. 12.

blood of Christ which is in heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of his Father; and that finally by his means they may enjoy with him the glory and kingdom of heaven! Amen.”*

“And although Theophylactus spake of the eating of the very body of Christ, and the drinking of his very blood (and not only of the figures of them), and of the conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ; yet he meaneth not of a gross, carnal, corporal and sensible conversion of the bread and wine, nor of a like eating and drinking of his flesh and blood (for so not only our stomachs would yearn, and our hearts abhor to eat his flesh and to drink his blood, but also such eating and drinking could nothing profit or avail us); but he spake of the celestial and spiritual eating of Christ, and of a sacramental conversion of the bread, calling the bread not only a figure, but also the body of Christ, giving us by these words to understand that in the sacrament we do not only eat corporally the bread (which is a sacrament and figure of Christ’s body), but spiritually we eat also his very body, and drink his very blood. And this doctrine of Theophylactus is both true, godly, and comfortable.”†

“And for a plain declaration hereof, the old ancient authors give two examples. One is of man, which is made of two parts, of a soul and of a body, and each of these two parts remain in man at one time; so that when the soul by the almighty power of God is put into the body, neither the body nor soul perisheth thereby, but thereof is made a perfect man, having a perfect soul and a perfect body, remaining in him both at one time. The other example, which the old authors bring in for this purpose, is of the holy supper of our Lord, which consisteth, say they, of two parts, of the sacrament or visible element of bread and wine, and of the body and blood of Christ. And as in them that duly receive the sacrament, the very natures of bread and wine cease not to be there, but remain there still, and be eaten and drunken corporally, as the body and blood of Christ be eaten and drunken spiritually; so likewise doth the divine nature of Christ remain still with his humanity.”‡

“Therefore when the old fathers called the mass or supper of the Lord a sacrifice, they meant that it was a sacrifice of lauds and thanksgiving (and so as well the people as the priest do sacrifice),

* Ibid., p. 30.

† Ibid., p. 187.

‡ Ibid., p. 278.

or else that it was a remembrance of the very true sacrifice propitiatory of Christ; but they meant in no wise that it is a very true sacrifice for sin, and applicable by the priest to the quick and dead. For the priest may well minister Christ's words and sacraments to all men, both good and bad; but he can apply the benefit of Christ's passion to no man, being of age and discretion, but only to such as by their own faith do apply the same unto themselves."*

"The other thing wherein Doctor Smith belieth me is this: he saith that I 'deny that we receive in the sacrament that flesh which is adjoined to God's own Son.' I marvel not a little what eyes Doctor Smith had when he read over my book. It is like that he had some privy spectacles within his head, wherewith whensoever he looketh, he seeth but what he list. For in my book I have written in more than an hundred places, that we receive the selfsame body of Christ that was born of the virgin Mary, that was crucified and buried, that rose again, ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; and the contention is only in the manner and form how we receive it."†

"So likewise go to the Lord's supper. When the bread is consecrated, when the words are spoken over it, then it is such an office that it beareth the name of the body and blood of Christ. Like as the magistrates because of their office are called *Domini*, Gods, so the bread presenteth His body, so that we go unto it worthily, and receive it with a good faith. Then we be assured that we feed upon Him spiritually. And like as the bread nourisheth the body, so the soul feedeth upon the very body and blood of Christ by faith, by believing Him to be a Saviour which delivered man from his sin."‡

"I do not say that the doctors did err. We do worship Christ in the heavens, and we do worship Him in the sacrament; but the massing worship is not to be used."§

"There is a change in the bread and wine, and such a change as no power but the omnipotency of God can make, in that that which

* Ibid., p. 353.

† Cranmer, Answer to Dr. Richard Smith. Ibid., p. 369.

‡ Latimer, Sermon XXXVI. Remains, Parker Society, p. 127.

§ Latimer, Disputation with Smith. Ibid., 273.

before was bread should now have the dignity to exhibit Christ's body; and yet the bread is still bread, and the wine still wine. For the change is not in the nature, but in the dignity, because now that which was common bread hath the dignity to exhibit Christ's body; for whereas it was common bread, it is now no more common bread, neither ought it to be so taken, but as holy bread, sanctified by God's word."*

"But here, before we go any further to search in this matter, and to wade, as it were, to search and try out, as we may, the truth hereof in the Scripture, it shall do well by the way to know, whether they, that thus make answer and solution unto the former principal question, do take away simply and absolutely the presence of Christ's body and blood from the sacrament, ordained by Christ, and duly ministered according to his holy ordinance and institution of the same. Undoubtedly, they do deny that utterly, either so to say, or so to mean. Hereof if a man do or will doubt, the books, which are written already in this matter of them that thus do answer, will make the matter plain.

Now then you will say, what kind of presence do they grant, and what do they deny? Briefly, they deny the presence of Christ's body in the natural substance of his human and assumed nature, and grant the presence of the same by grace: that is, they affirm and say, that the substance of the natural body and blood of Christ is only remaining in heaven, and so shall be unto the latter day, when he shall come again in glory, accompanied with the angels of heaven, to judge both the quick and the dead. And the same natural substance of the very body and blood of Christ, because it is united in the divine nature in Christ, the second Person of the Trinity, therefore it hath not only life in itself, but is also able to give, and doth give life unto so many as be, or shall be partakers thereof: That is, that to all that do believe on his name, which are not born of blood, as St. John saith, or of the will of the flesh, or of the will of man, but are born of God—though the self-same substance, abide still in heaven, and they, for the time of their pilgrimage, dwell here upon earth; by grace (I say), that is, by the gift of this life (mentioned in John) and the properties of the same, meet for our pilgrimage here upon earth, the same body of Christ is here present with us. Even as, for example, we say the same

* Latimer's Examination before the Commissioners. Ibid., p. 286.

sun, which, in substance, never removeth his place out of the heavens, is yet present here by his beams, light, and natural influence, where it shineth upon the earth. For God's word and his sacraments be, as it were, the beams of Christ, which is *Sol justitiæ*: the Sun of righteousness."*

"And that is this: 'Do this in remembrance of me.' Whereupon it seemeth to me to be evident, that Christ did take bread, and called it his body, for that he would thereby institute a perpetual remembrance of his body, specially of that singular benefit of our redemption, which he would then procure and purchase unto us by his body upon the cross. But bread, retaining still its own very natural substance, may be thus by grace, and in a sacramental signification, his body: whereas else the very bread, which he took, brake, and gave them, could not be in anywise his natural body, for that were confusion of substances. And therefore the very words of Christ, joined with the next sentence following, both enforce us to confess the very bread to remain still, and also open unto us, how that bread may be, and is thus, by his divine power, his body which was given for us."†

MATTHEW PARKER remained in England during the reign of Mary, and thus escaped the miserable influences of the continental reformers, as well as those of Knox and the other exiles, whose self-conceit and presumption was only equalled by their intense ignorance of antiquity, the story of the Christian Church, and the teaching of the Word of God.

Parker, says Hardwick, was consecrated at Lambeth, in 1559, and "proceeded with a happy mixture of prudence, gentleness, and firmness to reorganize the body over which he had been summoned to preside. He showed himself the great conservative spirit of the English reformation, sheltering many a treasure from the general wreck of ancient literature entailed by the destruction of the monasteries, and importing the same thoughts and feelings into his arrangements for securing the stability of religion. Parker had remained in England during

* Ridley, A brief Declaration of the Lord's Supper. Works. Parker Society, p. 12.

† Ibid., p. 15.

the reign of Mary. He was, therefore, less addicted than some others, whom he styles 'Germanical natures,' to the models of religious worship they had studied on the continent. His enemies indeed have censured him as little better than a Lutheran, owing to the views he held on controverted subjects, more especially on the doctrine of the sacraments. Yet he was Lutheran only in so far as Luther had revived the doctrine of the early Church, and 'followed the examples of the ancient and worthy Fathers.'"*

Parker was styled by the Puritans, a "Linseywolsey Bishop, Matthew Mealmouth, papist," and so forth. He earned also their intense ill will, by reviving the expression, *conferre gratiam* in describing the efficacy of both sacraments.

On the other hand he accounts for the tendency Romewards on the part of some persons, "by the disorderly preachings and writings of some Puritans, who will never be at a point."

During the great rebellion, when those same Puritans got the upper hand, and were able to carry out fully their policy of destruction and devastation, they ransacked his tomb in Lambeth Chapel, and cast his bones out with derision and contempt. Some pious souls, however, collected them together, and preserved them sacredly; and after the restoration they were brought back again to their former place.

HOLY EUCHARIST.

"For it is a matter of much contention in the realm; where most part of Protestants think it most meet to be in wafer-bread, as the injunction prescribeth; divers others, I cannot tell of what spirit, would have loaf-bread, &c. And hereupon one time at a sessions would one Master Fogg have indicted a priest for using wafer-bread, and me indirectly for charging the wafer-bread by injunction: where the judges were Mr. Southcote and Mr. Gerrard, who were greatly astonished upon the exhibiting of the book. * * * *

"First, I said, as her Highness talked with me once or twice in that point, and signified that there was one proviso in the act of the uniformity of Common Prayer, that by law is granted unto her, that if there be any contempt or irreverence used in the ceremonies or rites of the Church by the misusing of the orders ap-

* Hardwick, Reformation, p. 227.

pointed in the book, the Queen's Majesty may, by the advice of her commissioners, or metropolitan, ordain and publish such further ceremonies, or rites, as may be most for the reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and sacraments, and but for which law her Highness would not have agreed to divers orders of the book: And by virtue of which law she published further orders in her injunctions both for the communion-bread, and for the placing of the tables within the quire. They that like not the injunctions force much the statute in the book. I tell them that they do evil to make odious comparison betwixt statute and injunction, and yet I say and hold, that the injunction hath authority by proviso of the statute. And whereas it is said in the rule, that 'to take away the superstition which any person hath or might have in the bread and wine, it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usually to be eaten at the table with other meats, &c.;' 'it shall suffice' I expound, where either there wanteth such fine usual bread, or superstition be feared in the wafer-bread, they may have the communion in fine usual bread; which is rather a toleration in these two necessities, than is in plain ordering, as in the injunction."*

"As you desired, I send you here the form of the bread used, and was so appointed by order of my late lord of London (Grindall) and myself; as we took it not disagreeable to the injunction. And how so many churches hath of late varied I cannot tell: except it be the practice of the common adversary the devil, to make variance and dissension in the sacrament of unity. For where we be in one uniform doctrine of the same, and so cut off much matter of variance which the Lutherans and Zwinglians do hatefully maintain, yet because we will have some matter of dissension, we will quarrel in a small circumstance of the same, neither regarding God in His word, who earnestly driveth us to charity, neither regarding the love and subjection we should bear to our prince, who zealously would wish the devout administration of the sacrament, nor yet consider what comfort we might receive ourselves in the said sacrament, if dissension were not so great with us."†

"And as for their contention for wafer-bread and loaf-bread, if the order you have taken will not suffice them, they may fortune hereafter to wish they had been more conformable; although I

* Parker to Cecil, 8th January, 1570-1. Parker Correspondence, p. 375.

† Same to same. Ibid., p. 378.

trust that you mean not universally in your diocese to command or wink at the loaf-bread, but for peace and quietness, here and there to be contented therewith.”*

“These perilous times require our painful travails; and seeing that God’s cause is brought into question, and the Church many ways troubled, we must with good courage stand to the defence thereof, and resist the underminers.”†

WILLIAM BARLOW. Queen Mary was proclaimed in 1553. In that year a book came out purporting to be by Wm. Barlow, Bishop of Bath and Wells, violently assailing the Reformation. Its genuineness is denied by Burnet, and Anthony a Wood. But even what Heylyn tells us, with an apparent reserve, about Barlow, makes it not impossible to believe the contrary. Heylyn writes:—

“Which being observed by Bishop Barlow of Wells, and Scory of Chichester, they withdrew themselves beyond the seas. * * * But Barlow made not so much haste as not to be committed to the Fleet by the lords of the council, from whence upon some satisfaction given to the Lord Chancellor Gardiner, by his discreet and moderate answers, he was not long after set at liberty, and so crossed the seas, resolved to trust himself no more to a second hazard, having with so much difficulty escaped the first.”‡

Whether Heylyn knew all the facts about Barlow’s escape “beyond the seas,” may be doubted; but the documents and evidence produced by Strype clear everything up. And there is no reason now why he should be held up as a champion of the truth.

Strype says:—

“Some of these exiles had been caught before they could pass over the seas and escape; and having not courage and strength enough, were fain to recant. The chief of these were Jewel, Barlow,

* Parker to Parkhurst, June 14, 1574. *Ibid.*, p. 460.

† Parker Correspondence, p. 435.

‡ Peter Heylyn, *History of Reformation*, edition 1849, vol. 2, p. 99.

and Scory. * * * The said Barlow, Bishop of Bath and Wells, was by Gardiner * * * forced not only barely to recant, but to compose a book of recantation, which he did for fear of his life. And afterwards, when he fled, Gardiner, or some other, published his book to be read of all. Dr. Turner" says that "Mr. Barlow * * wrote a naughty and a false, lying book, compelled for fear to do so.

"The recantation of this man was as followeth, as I transcribed it out of the original, prescribed, as it seems, for him: 'Praise be to God, Who, out of His infinite goodness, and mercy inestimable, hath brought me out of darkness unto light, and from deadly ignorance unto the quick knowledge of the Truth. From the which, through the fiend's instigation and false persuasion, I have greatly swerved, wrapping myself in manifold errors and detestable heresies, against the doctrine of Christ, and determination of Holy Church. Insomuch that I have made certain books, and have suffered them to be imprinted as The Treatise on the burial of the Mass, &c. &c. In these treatises, I perceive and acknowledge myself grievously to have erred, namely, against the blessed sacrament of the altar, disallowing the Mass, and denying purgatory, with slanderous infamy of the Pope and my lord cardinal, and outrageous raving against the clergy, which I have forsaken and utterly renounced. * * * *

William Barlo.'

"This seems to have been Barlo's first address to the Queen, offering and praying to be received to a recantation, rather than the recantation itself. Whereby we may gather, how dear it cost him, as well as others, to get his liberty and life: namely, that he was not only to make a recantation, and a profession of being reconciled to the Papal Church, but to confess all the books that he ever made against that Church, and to renounce and revoke them; and also to be had under examination, and be a betrayer of all other faithful professors of religion, and to discover any other thing to the disservice of it. There was a book printed in 8vo. in 1553 in London, of this bishop's writing, intitled, The true original of the Lutheran faction, which seems to be the book before spoken of."*

Sir John Harington in his *Nugæ Antiquæ* has a good deal to say of Barlow, and very little to his credit.

* Strype Memorials, vol. 3, 153. Philadelphia Library, 1049, F.

"I speak now only of the spoil made under this bishop. Scarce were five years past after Bath's ruins, but as fast went the axes and hammers to work at Wells. * * * * The chapel of our Lady, late repaired by Stillington, a place of great reverence and antiquity, was likewise defaced, and such was their thirst after lead (I would they had drunk it scalding) that they took the dead bodies of bishops out of their leaden coffins. * * * * These things were, I will not say done, but I will say, at least suffered, by this bishop."*

He intimates very plainly that Barlow and the lord protector Somerset made ducks and drakes of the church's patrimony, and played very freely at give and take.

Heylyn states that on his being translated to Bath and Wells, Barlow gratified the lord protector with a present of eighteen or nineteen manors, which anciently belonged to it.†

No wonder then that when he returned to England on Elizabeth's accession, he had no heart for his old diocese, and gladly exchanged it for Chichester.

In 1536 Barlow, says Collier, was informed against for delivering the following passages in a sermon:—

"Imprimis. He affirmed and said, that wheresoever two or three simple persons, as two cobblers or weavers, were in company, and elected in the name of God, that there was the true Church of God.

* * * * *

Item. That if the king's grace, being supreme head of the Church of England, did choose, denominate, and elect any layman (being learned) to be a bishop; that he, so chosen (without mention made of any orders) should be as good a bishop as he is, or the best in England."‡

With all his other recantations he recanted also of course this nonsense in 1553, under the mild suasion and convincing arguments of my lord chancellor Gardiner. We do not hear of his reasserting it after 1560. Whether he did or no is of small consequence. This wretched prelate would have died out of men's minds long ago, were it not that he assisted at

* Vol. 2, 146, ed. 1804.

† Heylyn. Reformation, ed. 1849, vol. 1, p. 112.

‡ Collier. Ecclesiastical History, ed. in 8vo. of 1852, vol. 4, p. 381.

the consecration of Matthew Parker. But if he must be spoken of, the truth, though he cared little for it, should be told of him.

Of EDMUND SCAMBLER, Bishop of Peterborough 1560, and of Norwich 1584, and who had been chaplain to Archbishop Parker, little is told us by the Church Historians, and that little is not to his advantage.

“On which day also Mr. Edmond Scambler, Bachelor of Divinity, and one of the Prebendaries of the new collegiate Church of St. Peter in Westminster, was consecrated bishop of Peterborough. During the vacancy whereof, and in the time of his incumbency, Sir William Cecil, principal Secretary of Estate, possessed himself of the best manors in the Soake which belonged to it; and for his readiness to confirm the said manors to him, preferred him to the See of Norwich.”*

RICHARD COX. Very different indeed from these two men, Barlow and Scambler, who were mere church robbers, and surely very curious examples to be held up for our admiration, was Richard Cox, Bishop of Ely. Cox was one of the most eminent and learned men of his day, honest in his convictions, uncompromising, and absolutely fearless. He was tutor to Prince Edward, almoner to him when king, and took part in the translating and arranging of the Prayer-Book 1549. He was Chancellor of the University of Oxford, and Dean of Westminster. On the accession of Mary, he was deprived of his preferments, and went into exile. His arrival at Frankfort was hailed with enthusiasm by, what we may call, the conservatives among the exiles, then much vexed by Knox and his adherents, who had succeeded in suppressing the Prayer-Book. Cox put an end to this state of things, and by his influence and skill restored the book to its rights; and having the ear

* Heylyn. History of the Reformation, pub. by the Ecclesiastical History Society, vol. 2, p. 347. Collier tells the same story, adding that Scambler proved as unfortunate to Norwich, as he had been to Peterborough.

of the magistrates caused Knox to be sent away. On his return to England, he was again employed in revising the Book of Common Prayer, and unfortunately agreed with the others in taking the book of 1552, rather than that of 1549, as their basis. In 1559 he was made Bishop of Ely. In the Bishops' Bible, the Gospels, Acts, and Romans fell to his share.

"He enjoyed," says his biographer, "the episcopal dignity more than twenty-one years, and was justly considered one of the chief pillars and ornaments of the Church of England." He ably co-operated with Archbp. Parker, in restoring the church to the beauty and good order it had once enjoyed. He vigorously and resolutely aided the Archbishop in endeavouring to restrain and punish the Puritans, and when the Bishop of London

"Moved the privy-council in Dering's behalf [Dering* had been suspended from his lecture at St. Paul's], and this minister's suspension was taken off, he expostulated with the lord treasurer. He dealt plainly like a primitive bishop, and told his lordship the council went too far in restoring this dissenter upon their own authority; that the cognizance of the cause lay properly within the business of ecclesiastics; and that things relating to religion should not have been determined without their advice; that Dering had not given a satisfactory answer to the articles above mentioned; and that the suggestions upon which he was restored were untrue; and that the judgment of divines ought to be taken in these cases."†

This free spoken man lived, we will remember, in the reign of Elizabeth. How if he had lived in the reign of Victoria?

* Dering read lectures at St. Paul's. He condemned quoting the fathers in the pulpit, and called the testimonies of the ancients, and the vouching of councils, no better than entertaining the audience with vanities. He maintained that our Saviour upon the Cross not only suffered bodily pain, but anguish of mind, and that He lay under the indignation of God the Father. He maintained dangerous tenets with respect to the State. He told his congregation that Christians were lords of all, and that they had no sovereign in heaven or earth. He expressed himself as if faith had discharged them from subjection, raised them to a participation of our Saviour's condition, and made them rulers of the universe.¹

† Collier, vi. 524.

¹ Collier, vi. 510.

Brave and fearless, he fought strenuously for the patrimony of his See, even against the Queen's counsellors. Sir Christopher Hatton coveted one fat property, and Lord North another. But he struggled on, resisting law-suits, and all sorts of bitter attacks, and though he was forced to sacrifice something to save the rest, the real victory remained with him. In 1577, being nearly eighty years of age, he tried to resign his bishopric, the burden of which had grown too great for his feeble strength; but the Queen refused his request. And when a year or two afterwards she granted it, and the forms of resignation were drawn up, nobody of note was found willing to take the bishopric, on the terms proposed, namely, resigning all its best manors, and Richard Cox remained in possession till his death in 1581.

Bishop Cox was a liberal patron of learned men. He seems to have brought Whitgift forward, and made him his Chaplain.

"The Puritans, says Collier, besides their great patron, the Earl of Leicester, had no few friends at the council board. Under this countenance they appeared boldly in the cause, published pamphlets, and attacked the hierarchy, without much regard to truth or decency. * * * *

"The Bishop of Ely was highly sensible of these disorders, and dreaded the fatal issue in which they might terminate. In his letter to the archbishop, he endeavours to alarm his caution, and keep him on his guard; 'I doubt not,' he says, 'but ye are circumspect and vigilant, that these godless schismatics overrun not the realm, nor deface the face of our godly and well reformed Church.'"

Cox does not seem to have left any writings. His acts speak for him. He was probably, doctrinally, a moderate Churchman, possibly sharing the opinions of Peter Martyr, of whom he was a warm personal friend. At the disputation at Oxford in 1549, at which Dr. Cox presided, Peter Martyr maintained, 1. That the substance of the bread and wine was not changed; 2. That the body and blood of Christ was not carnally and bodily in the bread and wine, but united to the same sacramentally.

Cox wrote to Peter Martyr just after his consecration, complaining of the toleration still given to "the image of the

* Collier, vi. 510.

Cross and Him who was crucified" in the churches. But about the same time consented to act with the Archbishop in a public disputation before Moderators selected by the council, in the defence of the use. The opponents were Grindall and Jewell. This was in February, 1560. In the March of that year he wrote to Cassander on the subject. Cassander replied in favor of retaining the Cross, and gives quite a dissertation on its proper form, &c. Cox seems to have an equal antipathy for the Turk, the Pope, and the schismatics. The dread of the latter of these, forms, one might almost say, the staple of his letters.

"You candidly and truly confess, Master Gualtier, that there are some among those brethren who are a little morose; and you might add too, obstreperous, contentious, rending asunder the unity of a well constituted church, and everywhere handing up and down among the people a form of divine worship concocted out of their own heads; that book in the mean time, composed by godly fathers, and set forth by lawful authority, being altogether despised and trodden under foot."*

"There was formerly published by command of King Edward of pious memory, and with the advice and opinion of these excellent men, Master Bucer and Master Peter Martyr, then residing in England, a book of common prayer and sacraments for the use of the Church of England. But now as soon as our illustrious Queen Elizabeth had succeeded to the kingdom, she restored *this holy little book* to the Church of England, with the highest sanction of the whole kingdom. At that time no office or function of religion was committed to us who now preside over the churches; but when we were called to the ministry of the churches, we embraced that book with open arms, and not without thanks to God, Who had preserved for us such a treasure, and restored it to us in safety. For we know that this book ordains nothing contrary to the word of God."†

GRINDALL, Bishop of London 1559, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1575 to 1583, was celebrated as a preacher. He

* Cox to Gualtier, Feb. 12, 1571, p. 237.

† Ibid. Parker Society, Zurich Letters, vol. i. p. 235.

used, it is said of him, much moderation towards the puritans. He permitted great irregularities to creep into the service of the Church, which it is one of the glories of his greater successor Whitgift, that he labored with much energy and some success, to remove. In his Dialogue between Custom and Verity, is this passage on confession:

“Indeed confession, if it be discreetly used, is a laudable custom.”*

JOHN PARKHURST, tutor of the celebrated bishop Jewel, was an early adherent of the reformation. He left England on the accession of Mary, and returned to it again on Elizabeth's becoming Queen. He was made Bishop of Norwich in 1560. He was far more of a student of belles lettres, than a divine; though he took part in the Bishops' Bible, having for his share, Ecclesiasticus, Susanna, Baruch, and the books of the Maccabees. He has left nothing by which to judge of his theological views, but he did not share those of Parker, and was counted “remiss” in his conduct towards the puritans. Though when taken to task for this by the Queen and primate, he “readily obeyed” their commands.

The bibliographers give us as his best known work, the *Ludiera, sive Epigrammata Juvenilia*. A copy of these he sent in 1572, to an old and dear friend, as a new year's gift, calling them his “good, godly, and pleasant epigrams.” He died in 1574. Thus from first to last he was given to literature, rather than divinity, and seems to have been an easy going man, of warm heart, and quick temper, who was minded to let every one do as they pleased, so long as he could have rest and leisure to devote himself to his beloved Greek and Latin Poetry. Surely a bishop in England from 1560 to 1574 might have found something to do more worthy of and consonant with his office.

As an evidence of his kindness of heart, an anecdote is given by Jewel's biographer. Having Jewel and one or two other young men staying with him, in vacation, on the morning they were to go back to the University, he came to them, and

* Parker Society edition of his works, p. 57.

"seized upon their purses, saying, What money, I wonder, have these miserable and beggarly Oxfordians? And finding them pitifully lean and empty, stuffed them with money, till they became both fat and weighty."

JOHN JEWELL following the example of bishops Barlow and Scory, and having for his weakness this excuse that he had such example, recanted his "protestant errors" under the mild influences of Gardiner. "Though," says Gorton, "he subscribed to a confession of faith drawn up by the catholics, yet finding that they suspected his sincerity, and were about to prosecute him as a heretic, he withdrew secretly from Oxford, and with some difficulty made his escape to the continent." At Frankfort "he made a public confession before the exiles of his weakness and expressed his unfeigned contrition for it. In 1560 he was made bishop of Salisbury. He was a man of great intellectual ability, and his 'Apology' was looked upon as the great defence of the reformation." He seems to have shared at one time in the opinions of the puritans (he called the vestments, relics of the Amorites), but saw good reason to change his attitude towards them. When Horne gave a living to Humphrey, who had been imprisoned for non-conformity, Jewell refused to institute him, and subsequently made himself peculiarly obnoxious to his former friends.

HOLY EUCHARIST.

"But M. Harding saith: 'The Sacrifice of the Church is not thanksgiving, as our new masters teach us.' Certainly our sacrifice is the very Body of Christ, and that for ever, according to the order of Melchizedek, evermore standing in God's presence, and evermore obtaining pardon for us; not offered up by us, but offering us up unto God the Father. For the same, it is our part to offer unto God our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. And this is the doctrine, not only of them whom it liketh M. Harding to call new masters, but also of the oldest and most Catholic Doctors of the Church. And to allege one instead of many, St. Augustine hereof writeth thus: 'In these fleshly Sacrifices (of the Jews) there was a figure of the Flesh, that Christ afterward would offer: but in this Sacrifice of the Church there is a thanksgiving, and a re-

membrance of that Flesh, which Christ hath already offered for us.' If M. Harding will happily refuse St. Augustine, as mistrusted for one of these new masters, yet he may not well refuse his own Mass Book. There he himself even at his Mass is taught to say: 'We that do offer up to Thee this Sacrifice of praise.*'

"True it is, the ministration of the Holy Communion is oftentimes of the old learned fathers called a Sacrifice: not for that they thought the Priest had authority to sacrifice the Son of God, but for that therein we offer up unto God thanks and praises for the great Sacrifice once made upon the cross. So saith St. Augustine: 'In this Sacrifice is a thanksgiving, and a remembrance of the flesh of Christ, which He hath offered for us.' So Nazianzenus calleth the Holy Communion, 'A Figure of that great mystery of the death of Christ.' This it is that Eusebius calleth 'The Sacrifice of the Lord's Table:' which also he calleth 'The Sacrifice of praise.'†

"Chrysostom showeth in what sense other ancient fathers used this word, Sacrifice, and also utterly overthroweth M. Harding's whole purpose touching the same. For, as he saith, 'we offer up the same Sacrifice that Christ offered,' so in most plain wise, and by sundry words, he removeth all doubt, and declareth in what sort and meaning we offer it. He saith not, as M. Harding saith, 'We offer up the Son of God unto his Father, and that verily and indeed:' but contrariwise thus he saith, 'We offer indeed, but in remembrance of His death. This Sacrifice is an example of that Sacrifice. This that we do is done in remembrance of that that was done. We offer up the same that Christ offered: or rather we work the remembrance of that Sacrifice.' Thus we offer up Christ, that is to say, an example, a commemoration, a remembrance of the death of Christ. This kind of Sacrifice was never denied: but M. Harding's real Sacrifice was never yet proved."‡

With these words of Jewell, compare the following, from the famous Dominican, Luis de Granada.

"Y es el mismo sacrificio que se le ofrecio en la cruz: la misma persona de Christo ofrece aqui por su ministro el sacerdote; mas no de la misma manera: porque en la cruz estuvo visible y passible, con sentimiento de sus heridas, traspasado de dolores; mas aqui esta sacramentalmente, invisible, impassible, y glorioso: y

* Page 267.

† Defence of the Apology, Part II. p. 415.

‡ Ibid., p. 424.

assi no se le offrece agora en la Missa, como él se ofrecio al Padre en la cruz; sino como se ofrecio al mismo Padre en la cena, para que lo aceptasse, en memoria de como el dia siguiente se le avia de sacrificar en remedio de neustros peccados.”*

CONFESSION.

“Abuses and errors removed, specially the priest being learned, as we have said before, we mislike no manner of confession, whether it be private or public. For as we think it not unlawful to make open confession before many, so we think it not unlawful (abuses always excepted) to make the like confession in private, either before a few, or before one alone.”† “The difference that is between us and our adversaries in the whole matter is not great; saving that it liketh M. Harding to busy himself with needless quarrels without cause. Three kinds of confession are expressed unto us in the Scriptures. The first made secretly unto God alone: the secondly openly before the whole congregation; the third privately unto our brother. Of the two former kinds there is no question. Touching the third, if it be discreetly used, to the greater comfort and better satisfaction of the penitent, without superstition or other ill, it is not in any wise by us reprovèd. The abuses and errors set apart, we do no more mislike a ‘private confession’ than a ‘private sermon.’ Thus much only we say, that ‘private confession’ to be made unto the minister, is neither commanded by Christ, nor necessary to salvation.”‡

ROBERT HORNE. Though Robert Horne, who had been Dean of Durham, and had escaped to the continent with the rest of them, was thought by Dr. Cox to be a man of constancy and courage, and was therefore chosen by him, to take charge of the English congregation at Frankfort, when he went away, yet he does not seem to have been a strong man. He was attached, to be sure, to the liturgy and discipline of the English Church, and laboured, for a while, to keep them in possession of the field, Cox had won for them. But he lacked the ability, and per-

* Luis de Granada, tomo v. p. 709, a.

† Defence of Apology, II. VI. 1. T. IV. p. 486, ed. Jelf.

‡ Ibid., II, VII. 2, T. IV. p. 562.

haps also the clear-headedness and determination, of the latter. He finally gave way before the puritanic party and left the place. On the accession of Elizabeth, he was raised to the bishoprick of Winchester. He appears to have shared with his old opponents, their aversion to the vestments, and was weak enough to excuse his wearing them, by declaring that he did so against his own wishes and convictions, in order to keep out "a papistical, or at least a Lutheran-papistical ministry."*

One that avowedly does evil that good may come, is no example for any one. Why is Horne held up as one to us?

As EDWIN SANDYS, Bishop of Worcester 1559, and Archbishop of York 1576, joined with Parker, in 1573, in a communication declaring that "in the platform set down by these new builders we evidently see the spoliation of the patrimony of Christ, a popular state to be sought; the end will be ruin to religion and confusion to our country;" he can scarcely be considered as holding puritanic notions himself. He is clear enough on the Sacraments.

HOLY EUCHARIST.

"In this Sacrament there are two things, a visible sign, and an invisible grace: there is a visible sacramental sign of bread and wine, and there is the thing and matter signified, namely, the body and blood of Christ: there is an earthly matter, and an heavenly matter. * * * * This food offered us at the Lord's table is to feed our souls withal: it is meat for the mind and not for the belly. Our souls, being spiritual, can neither receive nor digest that which is corporal: they feed only upon spiritual food. It is the spiritual eating that giveth life."†

"Now as the graces of God purchased for us by Christ are offered unto us by the word, so are they also most lively and effectually by the sacraments. Christ hath instituted and left in his Church, for our comfort and the confirmation of our faith, two sacraments or seals; baptism, and the Lord's supper. In baptism

* See also his letter to Gualtier, July, 1565. Zurich Letters, vol. 1, p. 142.

† Archb. Sandys' Sermons, Parker Soc'y ed., p. 88.

the outward washing of the flesh declareth the inward purging and cleansing of the spirit. In the Eucharist or Supper of the Lord, our corporal tasting of the visible elements, bread and wine, sheweth the heavenly nourishing of our souls unto life by the mystical participation of the glorious body and blood of Christ. For inasmuch as He saith of these sacred elements, 'This is My body which is given for you;' and of the other, 'This is My blood,' he giveth us plainly to understand, that all the graces, which may flow from the body and blood of Christ Jesus, are in a mystery here not represented only, but presented unto us. So then, although we see nothing, feel and taste nothing, but bread and wine; nevertheless let us not doubt at all, but that He spiritually performeth that which He doth declare and promise by His visible and outward signs; that is to say, that in this sacrament there is offered unto the Church that very true and heavenly bread, which feedeth and nourisheth us unto eternal life; that sacred blood, which will cleanse us from sin and make us pure in the day of trial."*

THE ORNAMENTS RUBRIC.

"The last book of service is gone through, with a proviso to retain the ornaments which were used in the first and second year of King Edward, until it please the Queen to take other order for them. Our gloss upon this text is, that we shall not be forced to use them, but that others in the mean time shall not convey them away."†

JAMES PILKINGTON, Bishop of Durham 1560, favoured the Puritans, and wrote a letter to Leicester on their behalf, as far at least, as the disuse of the habits is concerned. The arguments used do not seem very forcible. At any rate, they did not convince himself, for he continued to wear them without scruple. He defended the Book of Common Prayer against the attacks of certain Roman Catholics, who asserted, that it was set forth by the mere authority of the laity. He had himself a share in the revising of the Liturgy at the accession of Queen Elizabeth.

I quote a few passages from his writings:—

* Ibid., p. 302.

† Sandys to Parker, April 30, 1559. Parker Correspondence, Parker Society ed., p. 65.

HOLY EUCHARIST.

“Under this name of a seal He commendeth unto us both His outward visible Sacraments, and the inward grace of the Holy Ghost, working in our consciences by them. St. Paul calleth circumcision (a Sacrament of the old law) ‘the seal of the righteousness of faith;’ and as that was a seal in that time to our fathers of righteousness, so be our Sacraments to us in these days seals of God’s promises unto us, and all have one strength and virtue. The Scripture of God is the indenture betwixt God and us, wherein is contained both the promises, grace, and mercy, that God offereth to the world in His Son Christ, and also the conditions which He requires to be fulfilled in our behalf: the Sacraments are the seals set to His indenture, to strengthen our faith, that we do not doubt. For it is not enough to write the conditions of a bargain in an indenture, except it be sealed; so God for our weakness, thought it not sufficient to make us promise of His blessings in writing in His Scripture; but He would seal it with His own blood, and institute His sacraments as seals of the same truth, to remain to be received of us in remembrance of Him and strengthening our faith.

Baptism is a sacrament sealed by God, and sealing our consciences that God taketh us for His children and servants: and we offer and bind ourselves to serve Him only, as a Lord and Father. The Supper is also a sacrament, wherein He feeds us spiritually, thus taken into His service, with His own precious body and blood; and we, reckoning with ourselves wherein we have offended Him, ask mercy, nothing doubting to obtain it, and renew our bond to Him which we have so often broken, and promise to do so no more.”*

“So it is an easy matter to enter into God’s church by baptism; but if thou fall after, how hard it is to rise again, daily experience teacheth. We must repent, fast, pray, give alms, forsake ourselves, condemn ourselves, with bitter tears and trembling work our salvation, stand in continual war against the devil, the world, and our affection; which things to do, are more common in our mouths than in our own lives, and more do talk of them than practise them. God for His mercy’s sake forgive us and amend us all.”†

* Pilkington’s Works, Parker Society ed., p. 192.

† Ibid., p. 448.

"The church of God, according to the Scriptures, does profess and believe that all faithful Christians, worthily coming to the Lord's table, receive by faith, in those holy mysteries, the body and blood of Christ, which was given, broken, and shed for the sins of the whole world. This we teach, believe, and follow, and exhort all men often to prepare themselves worthily thus to receive."*

"Ye lie in saying * * * * that we give nothing but bare bread and wine now. Prove where the church teaches so. * * * With what face can they say, we have no consecration and give nothing but bare bread and wine? If they have any in their mass, if the Evangelists have any consecration, or Paul, or if the Apostles, we have it also. For if consecration stand in words, we have all the words that their Mass, the Gospel, St. Paul, or the Apostles had."†

HOLY EUCHARIST.

From the Homilies.

"Neither need we to think that such exact knowledge is required of every man, that he be able to discuss all high points in the doctrine thereof; but thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent. But, as the Scripture saith, the table of the Lord, the bread and cup of the Lord, the memory of Christ, the annunciation of His death, yea, the communion of the body and blood of the Lord, in a marvellous incorporation, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost (the very bond of our conjunction with Christ) is through faith wrought in the souls of the faithful, whereby not only their souls live to eternal life, but they surely trust to win their bodies a resurrection to immortality.

The true understanding of this fruition and union, which is betwixt the body and the head, betwixt the true believers and Christ, the ancient Catholic fathers both perceiving themselves, and commending to their people, were not afraid to call this supper, some of them, the salve of immortality and sovereign preservative against death; other, a deifical communion; other, the sweet dainties of our Saviour, the pledge of eternal health, the defence of faith, the hope

* Ibid., p. 552.

† Pilkington's Questions and Answers, p. 635.

of the resurrection; other, the food of immortality, the healthful grace, and the conservatory to everlasting life.”*

“O man, whither rushest thou unadvisedly? It is a table of peace, and thou art ready to fight. It is a table of singleness, and thou art imagining mischief. It is a table of quietness, and thou art given to debate. It is a table of pity, and thou art unmerciful. Dost thou neither fear God, the maker of this feast; nor reverence His Christ, the refecton and meat; nor regardest His spouse, His well beloved guest; nor weighest thine own conscience, which is sometime thine inward accuser?”†

With these loving and true words of our Homilies, corresponds exactly the following glowing passage from the works of that great light of the Spanish Church, Luis de Granada: *O si sic omnia.*

Pues del sacramento de la communion qué diré? Este es el sacramento de sacramentos, el mysterio de mysterios, el beneficio de beneficios, y el memorial de todas las maravillas de Dios. Este es sacramento de gracia, sacramento de amor, sacramento de unidad, sacramento de devocion, y de remission, y de todos los bienes. Aqui es el hombre visitado de Dios, aqui es honrado con la presencia divina, aqui es hecho templo vivo del cuerpo de Christo. Aqui se da la gracia en mayor abundancia, aqui se gusta la divina suavidad en su misma fuente, aqui se enciende el fuego del amor de Dios, aqui se abraza el anima con su verdadero y legitimo esposo; de donde resultan en ella maravillosos deleytes. Este es el viatico con que se ha de andar el camino del cielo; y este es el pan de trabajadores con que se esfuerzen los que trabajan y caban en la viña del Señor. Aqui se renewan los buenos propositos, aqui reverdescen los buenos deseos, aqui se acrecienta la devocion, aqui se abren las fuentes de las lagrimas, aqui se refresca la juventud del anima, y aqui finalmente se mantiene y come de Christo, que es su proprio pasto, y el mayor bien que en esta vida puede recibir. Porque no es otra cosa comer à Christo, sino hazernos participantes de su espiritu, de su sangue, de sa gracia, de sus merescimientos, y de sus trabajos. Porque assi como el que come haze suyo lo que come, assi el que come à Christo aplica à si el espiritu y la gracia de Christo: para que transformado yá en él, sea en su manera

* Homily. Concerning the Sacrament, p. 398.

† Ibid., 408.

mirado del Padre eterno con aquellos ojos que es mirado él; no yá como extraño y peregrino; sine como hijo suyo. Pues con qué pagaremos al Señor tan grande beneficio?*

THOMAS BECON, chaplain to Cranmer, and Prebendary of Canterbury, died about the year 1570. He was one of the most prominent and violent (in language) of the Puritan party. His writings are quite voluminous. It is distressing to see a man who thought he was laboring and striving for the truth, guilty of giving utterance to such foul and disgusting words and expressions as he does. Abuse and vilification never can do good. Even in what Becon puts forth as prayers, as petitions addressed to the Almighty, to Him who is purity and love, are the vilest and most abominable words and phrases. I cannot quote them. Those who wish to satisfy themselves of the truth of my assertion have but to turn to his "Flower of Godly Prayers."†

CONFESSION.

"Here see we that the ministers of God's Word are not to be despised; for they are necessary instruments unto the health of men, and they are 'worthy of double honour,' as the Apostle saith. Therefore may it be concluded that the absolution of the priest is not to be despised; seeing it is none other thing, if it be a true and Christian absolution, than the preaching of free remission of our sins in Christ's name."‡

"Now the absolution being, as I said before, nothing else but the preaching of free deliverance from sin by the death of Jesu Christ (for God alone forgiveth sin and absolveth the faithful penitent), it ought not to be contemned and despised; but whensoever the minister of the Lord's word, be it privately or openly, shall rehearse unto men the sweet and comfortable words of God's mercy toward all them that repent in faith, they ought to give earnest faith unto them, being undoubtedly persuaded that their sins at that time be assuredly forgiven them, as though God Himself had spoken these words, according to this saying of Christ, 'He that heareth you, heareth Me.'"

* Luis de Granada. Tome III., p. 218, b.

† Parker Socy. edition, p. 22.

‡ Becon, *Castle of Comfort*. Works, Catechism, etc., p. 565.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 568.

HOLY EUCHARIST.

"And in a certain gloss recited in the Pope's law we read thus: 'As in baptism Christ is put on sometime sacramentally, and sometime unto the sanctification of life (the first is common both to good and bad, but the second is proper only to the good); so likewise Christ is eaten of evil persons sacramentally only: but of the good He is received both sacramentally and spiritually, and of all the faithful spiritually.'"*

"All these testimonies of the ancient writers, diligently considered, declare manifestly that not the wicked and unfaithful, but the godly and faithful persons only eat the body and drink the blood of Christ. The ungodly eat the sacrament; but they eat not Christ, which is signified by the sacrament, as St. Augustine writeth of Judas, 'The apostles,' saith he, 'did eat bread that was the Lord; but Judas did eat but the bread of the Lord, and not the bread that was the Lord.' For whosoever eateth Christ liveth for ever, dwelleth in Christ, and Christ in him, is incorporated and made all one with Christ, is made a member of Christ's body, is sanctified and made holy, is made clean both in body and soul, dieth not the death of a sinner, hath remission of his sins, obtaineth immortality, escheweth all evils of death, and forever liveth with Christ. But none of all these things chance to the unfaithful and wicked persons; therefore eat they not the body of Christ, nor yet drink His blood."†

"And is Christ received corporally with the corporal mouth of the faithful communicants? The natural body of Christ is only in heaven; and notwithstanding, the soul of the faithful communicant with her mouth, that is to say, with faith, doth truly and unfeignedly feed upon it unto her great joy and comfort, and feeleth no less true refection than the body doth by receiving corporal food; yea, the faithful communicant, thus eating and receiving Christ, receiveth both in body and soul an heavenly nourishment, a singular comfort, and an unoutspeakable joy. * * * *

"Hereto pertaineth the saying of St. Augustine, 'Why dost thou prepare thy teeth and thy belly? believe and thou hast eaten. For to believe in Him is to eat the bread of life. He that believeth in Him eateth Him.'"

"Likewise saith St. Cyprian, 'So oft as we do these things (he speaketh of receiving the mysteries of the body and blood of Christ),

* Gratian Decretals.

† Becon, The Catechism, p. 294.

we whet not our teeth to bite, but with pure faith we break the holy bread.'

"Hereto agreeth the saying of Eusebius Emissenus, which lived about three hundred years after Christ's ascension: 'When thou dost go up to the reverend altar to feed upon spiritual meat, look upon the holy body and blood of thy God with thy faith, honor Him, touch Him with thy mind, take Him with the hand of thy heart, and chiefly drink Him with the draught of thy inward man.' * * * *

"And in the Nicene Council we are admonished, 'Not to look down unto the bread and the cup that are set on the Lord's table; but to lift up our minds, and with our faith to consider the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world.'

"Bertrammus saith, speaking of the body and blood of Christ: 'It is a spiritual meat, and a spiritual drink, spiritually feeding the soul, and giving the life of everlasting satiety, as our Saviour himself, commending this mystery, saith It is the spirit that quickeneth; for the flesh profiteth nothing.'"

"In the Pope's own law we read thus: 'Christ is eaten two manner of ways: one way sacramentally, which chanceth both to the good and to the bad: another way, when He is received by faith and love working together; and this belongeth only to the good.'

"I perceive now right well, that Christ's natural body is not eaten, as the Papists teach, with the mouth of the body, but with the mouth of the soul, which is faith. It is truth. For thus read we in the book of the Pope's canons, 'Christ cannot be devoured with teeth.'"*

"Christ alone is our altar, our sacrifice, and our priest. Our altar is in heaven. Our altar is not made of stone, but of flesh and blood; of whom the apostle writeth thus: 'We have an altar, whereof it is not lawful for them to eat which serve in the tabernacle.'"+

"Finally, who knoweth not that we come unto the Lord's table, not to offer bloody sacrifices to the performance whereof we had need of altars, but to eat and drink and spiritually to feed upon Him that was once crucified and offered up for us on the altar of the cross, a sweet-smelling sacrifice to God the Father, yea, and that once for all? Now, if we come together to eat and drink these

* Becon, The Catechism, p. 295.

† Ibid., p. 297.

holy mysteries, and so spiritually to eat Christ's body, and to drink His blood, unto salvation both of our bodies and souls, who seeth not that a table is more meet for the celebration of the Lord's Supper than an altar?"*

"But I would wish with all my heart, that either this kneeling at the receiving of the sacrament were taken away, or else that the people were taught that that outward reverence was not given to the sacrament and outward sign, but to Christ, which is represented by that sacrament or sign."†

WHITGIFT, Archbishop of Canterbury 1583 to 1603, was a man of resolute and determined character, and a warm defender of the polity of our church against the Puritans. His extant writings are directed entirely against them. I give several short extracts, one of which is as well timed to-day as it was when first penned.

"I am certainly persuaded that, if the churches beyond sea did fully understand your proceedings, together with the state of the Church of England, that they would as bitterly write against you, and as willingly condemn you, as they did the Anabaptists."‡

"Diaconus and Presbyter or *Sacerdos* be distinct in all authors."§

"The protestation made in King Edward's days touching this posture [*i. e.*, kneeling in the receiving of the Holy Communion], was to satisfy (if it might be) such quarrellers as you are, and to take away all occasion of cavilling, not for any great fear of adoration."||

He says to the Puritans:—

"You contrary to all obedience, duty, and oath, openly violate and break those laws, orders, and statutes which you ought to obey, and to the which some of you by oath is bound. If your doings proceed from a good conscience, then leave that living and place which bindeth you to those things that be against your conscience. * * * * What honesty is there to swear to statutes and laws, and, when you have so done, contrary to your oath to

* Ibid., p. 298.

† Ibid., p. 298.

‡ Whitgift, vol. ii. p. 1.

§ Ibid., p. 527.

| Vol. iii. p. 91.

break them, and yet still to remain under them, and enjoy that place which requireth obedience and subjection to them.”*

“Touching the 24 articles which your lordship seemeth so much to mislike, as written in a Romish style, smelling of the Romish inquisition, &c., I cannot but marvel at your lordship’s vehement speeches against them.”†

“Neither do I fear the displeasure of man, nor regard the wretched tempers of the uncharitable, which call me tyrant, pope, papist, knave, and lay to my charge things which I never did nor thought upon.”‡

Another letter twelve days later to Lord Burghley:—

“My enemies and the evil tongues of this uncharitable sect report also that I am revolted, become a papist, and I know not what.”§

RICHARD HOOKER.—Who that has read with admiration and wonder the famous fifth book of the Ecclesiastical Polity of RICHARD HOOKER, or has devoured with eagerness and delight his life by Izaak Walton, can help loving the meekness of the heart, and reverencing the majesty of the intellect of one whom every generation since his time has chosen to call “the judicious.”

Hooker died in 1600, three years after the publication of this fifth book. His work was written in defence of the Church of England against the Puritans.

CONFESSION.

“And for private confession and absolution it standeth thus with us:—

The minister’s power to absolve is publicly taught and professed, the Church not denied to have authority either of abridging or enlarging the use and exercise of that power, upon the people no such necessity imposed of opening their transgressions unto men, as if remission of sins otherwise were impossible; neither any such opinion had of the thing itself, as though it were either unlawful or unprofitable, saving only for these inconveniences, which the

* Ibid., p. 320.

† Ibid., p. 606.

‡ Ibid., p. 604.

§ Ibid., p. 608.

world hath by experience observed in it heretofore. And in regard thereof, the Church of England hitherto hath thought it the safer way to refer men's hidden crimes unto God and themselves only; howbeit, not without special caution for the admonition of such as come to the holy Sacrament, and for the comfort of such as are ready to depart the world.

First, because there are but few that consider how much that part of divine service which consisteth in partaking the holy Eucharist doth import their souls; what they lose by neglect thereof, and what by devout practice they might attain unto: therefore, lest carelessness of general confession should, as commonly it doth, extinguish all remorse of men's particular enormous crimes; our custom (whensoever men present themselves at the Lord's Table) is, solemnly to give them very fearful admonition what woes are perpendicularly hanging over the heads of such as dare adventure to put forth their unworthy hands to those admirable mysteries of life, which have by rare examples been proved conduits of irremediable death to impenitent receivers; whom therefore as we repel being known, so being not known we can but terrify. Yet, with us, the ministers of God's most holy word and sacraments, being all put in trust with the custody and dispensation of those mysteries, wherein our communion is and hath been ever accounted the highest grace that men on earth are admitted unto, have therefore all equally the same power to withhold that sacred mystical food from notorious evil livers, from such as have any way wronged their neighbours, and from parties between whom there doth open hatred and malice appear, till the first sort have reformed their wicked life, the second recompensed them unto whom they were injurious, and the last condescended unto some course of Christian reconciliation, whereupon their mutual accord may ensue. In which cases, for the first branch of wicked life, and the last which is open enmity, there can arise no great difficulty about the exercise of his power: in the second, concerning wrongs, there may, if men shall presume to define or measure injuries according to their own conceits, depraved oftentimes as well by error as partiality, and that no less in the minister himself, than in any other of the people under him. The knowledge therefore which he taketh of wrongs must rise as it doth in the other two, not from his own opinion or conscience, but from the evidence of the fact which is committed; yea, from such evidence as neither doth admit denial nor defence. For if the offender having either colour of law to uphold, or any other pretence to excuse his own uncharitable and

wrongful dealings, shall wilfully stand in defence thereof, it serveth as a bar to the power of the minister in this kind.

* * * * *

Leaving therefore unto his judgment them whom we cannot stay from casting their own souls into so great hazard, we have in the other part of penitential jurisdiction, in our power and authority to release sin, joy on all sides, without trouble or molestation unto any. And if to give be a thing more blessed than to receive, are we not infinitely happier in being authorized to bestow the treasure of God, than when necessity doth constrain to withdraw the same.

They which, during life and health, are never destitute of ways to delude repentance, do notwithstanding, oftentimes when their last hour draweth on, both feel that sting which before lay dead in them, and also thirst after such helps as have been always till then unsavoury. St. Ambrose's words touching late repentance are somewhat hard, 'If a man be penitent and receive absolution (which cannot in that case be denied him) even at the very point of death, and so depart, I dare not affirm he goeth out of the world well; I will counsel no man to trust to this, because I am loth to deceive any man, seeing I know not what to think of it. Shall I judge such a one a castaway? Neither will I avouch him safe: all I am able to say is, Let his estate be left to the will and pleasure of Almighty God. Wilt thou be therefore clearly delivered of all doubt? Repent while yet thou art healthy and strong. If thou defer it till time give no longer possibility of sinning, thou canst not be thought to have left sin, but rather sin to have forsaken thee.' Such admonitions may in their time and place be necessary, but in no wise prejudicial to the generality of God's own high and heavenly promise. 'Whosoever a sinner doth repent from the bottom of his heart, I will put out all his iniquity.' And of this, although it hath pleased God not to leave to the world any multitude of examples, lest the careless should too far presume; yet one hath He given, and that most memorable, to withhold from despair in the mercies of God, at what instant soever man's unfeigned conversion be wrought. Yea, because to countervail the fault of delay, there are in the latest repentance oftentimes the surest tokens of sincere dealing: therefore upon special confession made to the minister of God, he presently absolveth in this case the sick party from all his sins by that authority which Jesus Christ hath committed unto him, knowing that God respecteth not so much what time is spent, as what truth is shewed in repentance."*

* Hooker, Ecclesiastical Polity (ed. Keble), Book VI., ch. iv. 15, p. 50.

"Furthermore, because the knowledge how to handle our own sores is no vulgar and common art, but we either carry towards ourselves for the most part an oversoft and gentle hand, fearful of touching too near the quick, or else endeavouring not to be partial, we fall into timorous scrupulosities, and sometimes into those extreme discomforts of mind, from which we hardly do ever lift up our heads again; men thought it the safest way to disclose their secret faults, and to crave imposition of penance from them whom our Lord Jesus Christ hath left in His Church to be spiritual and ghostly physicians, the guides and pastors of redeemed souls, whose office doth not only consist in general persuasions unto amendment of life, but also in the private particular cure of diseased minds."*

HOLY EUCHARIST.

"Take therefore that wherein all agree, and then consider by itself what cause why the rest in question should not rather be left as superfluous than urged as necessary. It is on all sides plainly confessed, first, that this sacrament is a true and a real participation of Christ, who thereby imparteth himself even his whole entire Person *as a mystical Head* unto every soul that receiveth him, and that every such receiver doth thereby incorporate or unite himself unto Christ *as a mystical member* of him, yea, of them also whom he acknowledgeth to be his own; secondly, that to whom *the person of Christ* is thus communicated, to them he giveth by the same sacrament his Holy Spirit to sanctify them as it sanctifieth him which is their head; thirdly, that what *merit, force or virtue soever there is in his sacrificed body and blood* we freely, fully, and wholly have it by this sacrament; fourthly, that *the effect thereof in us is a real transmutation of our souls and bodies* from sin to righteousness, from death and corruption to immortality and life; fifthly, that because the sacrament being of itself but a corruptible and earthly creature must needs be thought an unlikely instrument to work so admirable effects in man, we are therefore to rest ourselves altogether upon *the strength of his glorious power* who is able and will bring to pass that the bread and cup which he giveth us shall be truly the thing he promiseth."†

"Let it therefore be sufficient for me, presenting myself at the Lord's table, to know what there I receive from him, without searching or inquiring of the manner how Christ performeth his

* Ibid., Book VI., ch. iv. 7, p. 81.

† Book V., lxvii. 7, p. 354.

promise; let disputes and questions, enemies to piety, abatements of true devotion, and hitherto in this cause but over-patiently heard, let them take their rest; let curious and sharp-witted men beat their heads about what questions themselves will, the very letter of the word of Christ giveth plain security that these mysteries do as nails fasten us to his very Cross, that by them we draw out, as touching efficacy, force and virtue, even the blood of his gored side, in the wounds of our Redeemer we there dip our tongues, we are dyed red both within and without, our hunger is satisfied and our thirst forever quenched; they are things wonderful which he feeleth, great which he seeth, and unheard of which he uttereth, whose soul is possessed of this Paschal Lamb, and made joyful in the strength of this new wine, this bread hath in it more than the substance which our eyes behold, this cup, hallowed with solemn benediction, availeth to the endless life and welfare both of soul and body, in that it serveth as well for a medicine to heal our infirmities and purge our sins as for a sacrifice of thanksgiving, with touching it sanctifieth, it enlighteneth with belief, it truly conformeth us unto the image of Jesus Christ; what these elements are in themselves it skilleth not, it is enough that to me which take them they are the body and blood of Christ, his promise in witness hereof sufficeth, his word he knoweth which way to accomplish; why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this, 'O my God, thou art true! O my soul, thou art happy!'"*

"A manifest effect whereof may be noted if we compare with our Lord's disciples in the twentieth of John the people that are said in the sixth of John to have gone after him to Capernaum. These leaving him on the one side the sea of Tiberias, and finding him again as soon as themselves by ship were arrived on the contrary side, whither they knew that by ship he came not, and by land the journey was longer than according to the time he could have to travel; as they wondered, so they asked also, 'Rabbi, when camest thou hither?' The disciples, when Christ appeared to them in far more strange and miraculous manner, moved no question, but rejoiced greatly in that they saw. For why? The one sort beheld only that in Christ which they knew was more than natural, but yet their affection was not rapt therewith through any great extraordinary gladness. The other, when they looked on Christ,

* Book V., lxvii., 12, 361.

were not ignorant that they saw the wellspring of their own everlasting felicity; the one because they enjoyed, not disputed, the other disputed, not because they enjoyed.

"If, then, the presence of Christ with them did so much move, judge what their thoughts and affections were at the time of this new presentation of Christ, not before their eyes, but within their souls. They had learned before that his flesh and blood are the true cause of eternal life; that this they are not by the bare force of their own substance, but through the dignity and worth of his Person which offered them up by way of sacrifice for the life of the whole world, and doth make them still effectual thereunto; finally that to us they are life in particular, by being particularly received. Thus much they knew, although as yet they understood not perfectly to what effect or issue the same would come, till at the length being assembled for no other cause which they could imagine but to have eaten the Passover only that Moses appointeth, when they saw their Lord and Master, with hands and eyes lifted up to heaven, first bless and consecrate for the endless good of all generations till the world's end, the chosen elements of bread and wine, which elements made for ever the instruments of life by virtue of his divine benediction, they being the first that were commanded to receive from him, the first which were warranted by his promise that not only unto them at the present time, but to whomsoever they and their successors after them did duly administer the same, those mysteries should serve as conducts of life and conveyances of his body and blood unto them, was it possible they should hear that voice, 'Take, eat, this my body; drink ye all of this; this is my blood;' possible that doing what was required, and believing what was promised, the same should have present effect in them, and not fill them with a kind of fearful admiration at the heaven which they saw in themselves? They had at that time a sea of comfort and joy to wade in, and we, by that which they did, are taught that this heavenly food is given for the satisfying of our empty souls, and not for the exercising of our curious and subtile wits."*

JAMES USHER, an eminently learned divine of the Calvinistic school, was translated to Armagh in 1624.

* Book V., lxvii., 3-4, p. 350.

CONFESSION.

"Be it therefore known unto him that no kind of confession, either public or private, is disallowed by us, that is in any way requisite for the due execution of that ancient power of the keys which Christ bestowed upon His church.

From confession we are now to proceed unto absolution, which it were a pity this man should receive, before he made confession of the open wrong he hath here done, in charging us to deny 'that priests have power to forgive sins.' Whereas the very formal words which our church requireth to be used in the ordination of a minister, are these: 'Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained.' And therefore, if this be all the matter, the Fathers and we shall agree well enough, however this make-hate would fain put friends together by the ears, where there is no occasion at all of quarrel. For we acknowledge most willingly, that the principal part of the priest's ministry is exercised in the matter of 'forgiveness of sins;' question only is of the manner, how this part of their function is executed by them and of the bounds and limits thereof.

To forgive sins, therefore, being thus proper to God only and to His Christ, His ministers must not be held to have this power communicated unto them, but in an improper sense, namely, because God forgiveth by them, and hath appointed them, both to apply these means by which He useth to forgive sins, and to give notice unto repentant sinners of that forgiveness. For 'who can forgive sins but God alone?' 'Yet doth He forgive by them also, unto whom He hath given power to forgive,' saith St. Ambrose and his followers."*

HOLY EUCHARIST.

"In this ministry of the blessed Sacrament, the service is first presented unto God (from which as from a most principall part of the dutie, the Sacrament it selfe is called the Eucharist, because therein we offer a special sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving alwaies unto God), and then communicated unto the use of God's People, in the performance of which part of the service, both the minister was said to give, and the communicant to receive the sacrifice: as well as in respect of the former part, they were said to offer the same unto the Lord."

* Answer to * * * * a Jesuit, London, 1686. Philadelphia Library, 1843 and 2192, Q.

“Whereby it doth appeare, that the Sacrifice of the elder times was not like unto the new Masse of the Romanists, wherein the Priest alone doth all ; but unto our Communion, where others also have full libertie given unto them to eat of the Altar as well as they that serve the Altar.”*

JOSEPH MEDE, born 1586, died 1638, was “a pious and profoundly learned divine.” He was taken away before the storm, which levelled throne and altar, fairly burst upon his wretched country. He was no friend of the “papists,” for with Andrewes, Jackson, and others he maintained that the pope was Antichrist. He was deeply versed in the Scriptures and in Christian antiquities.

CONFESSION.

“An effect of this contrition is confession ; when, out of a contrite and wounded heart, we acknowledge and lay open our sins before the face of Almighty God (our heavenly Father), begging pardon and forgiveness for them. A duty always necessary to be performed to God Himself, whom we have chiefly and principally offended ; and in some cases also convenient to be made unto His ministers, not only for advice, but for consolation, by that power and authority which God hath given them to exercise in His name, according to that ‘Whose sins ye remit, shall be remitted.’ ‘For if we confess our sins (saith St. John) He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness :’ and Proverbs, ‘He that covereth his sins shall not prosper ; but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy.’”†

HOLY EUCHARIST.

“For there He is commemorated and received by us for the same end for which He was given and suffered for us ; that through Him we receiving forgiveness of our sins, God our father might accept our service, and hear our prayers we make unto Him. What time then so fit and seasonable to commend our devotions unto

* A Discourse of the Religion anciently professed by the Irish and British. By James Usher, Abp. of Armagh and Primate of Ireland. London, 1631, p. 35. Philadelphia Library, 1836. Q.

† Mede's Works, p. 109, Discourse XXVI.

God, as when the Lamb of God lies slain upon the Holy Table; and we receive visibly, though mystically, those gracious pledges of His blessed body and blood? This was that sacrifice of the ancient church the fathers so much ring in our ears; the sacrifice of praise and prayer through Jesus Christ mystically represented in the creatures of bread and wine. * * * *

"And this is that Sacrifice which Malachi foretold the Gentiles should one day offer unto God: In every place Incense shall be offered unto My name, and a pure *Mincha*: for My name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts. * * * *

"This title of *purity* is given to the Christian *Mincha* in respect of Christ, whom it signifies and represents, Who is a sacrifice without all spot, blemish, and imperfection."

"Though the Eucharist be a sacrifice, that is, an oblation wherein the offerer banquets with his God; yet is Christ in this sacrifice no otherwise offered than by way of commemoration only of His sacrifice once offered upon the cross. * * * * But this commemoration is to be made to God His Father, and is not a bare remembering or putting ourselves in mind only, as is commonly supposed, but a putting of God in mind; for every sacrifice is directed unto God, and the oblation therein, whatsoever it be, hath Him for its object, and not man. If therefore the Eucharist be *Sacrificium Christi commemorativum*, as ours grant, then must the commemoration therein be made unto God: And if Christ therein be offered *objective*, that is, as the object of the commemoration there made, if the commemoration of Him be an oblation of Him, to whom is this oblation, that is, commemoration, made but unto God?

"Well then Christ is offered in this sacred Supper, not *hypostatically*, for so he was but once offered, but commemoratively only; that is, by this sacred rite of bread and wine we represent and inculcate His blessed passion to His Father; we put Him in mind thereof, by setting the monuments thereof before Him; we testify our own mindfulness thereof unto His sacred majesty; that so He would, for His sake, according to the tenor of His covenant, in Him, be favorable and propitious unto us, miserable sinners."†

WILLIAM FORBES, Bishop of Edinburgh 1634, lived but three months after his consecration to that See. His *Considerationes*

* Jos. Mede, ed. 1677, p. 357, &c.

† Ibid., p. 376.

Modestæ were published after his death in 1658. They were reprinted twice in the 18th century on the Continent. A new edition with an English translation by George H. Forbes forms part of the Anglo-Catholic Library. The book is a repertory of learning, and is, in fact, made up of quotations from the fathers, schoolmen, and known and forgotten Roman and Protestant divines, with his comments and remarks upon them.

HOLY EUCHARIST.

“The opinion of those Protestants and others seems most safe and most right, who think, nay, who most firmly believe, that the body and blood of Christ is truly, really, substantially present,* and taken in the Eucharist, but in a way which is incomprehensible to the human understanding, and much more, beyond the power of man to express; which is known to God alone, and not revealed to us in Scripture; a way not indeed corporeal or by oral reception, but not by the mere understanding and simple faith either, but by another way, known as has been said to God alone, and to be left to His omnipotence.”*

“In the Supper, moreover, by the wonderful power of the Holy Ghost, we invisibly communicate with the substance of the Body [and Blood] of Christ, of which we are made partakers, no otherwise than if we visibly ate and drank His flesh and blood. In Baptism there is a laver, but here an aliment. Baptism is the entrance into the Church; the Supper is our nourishment and preservation in the Church. ‘Baptism is salvation, the sacrament of the body of Christ is life,’ as St. Augustine says.”†

“Lastly, those err most gravely who argue that ‘Christ is not really in the Eucharist,’ by weak reasonings such as these; Christ is in heaven, is circumscribed in place, &c., therefore He is not in very deed, or really present in the Eucharist. For no one in his senses thinks that Christ, visibly or invisibly, descends from heaven or from the right hand of the Father in order ‘to be locally present in the Supper or in the symbols.’ All the faithful, with unanimous consent and one voice profess that they firmly retain these articles of the faith, ‘He ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right

* Vol. 2, p. 389, 7.

† Ibid., p. 421.

hand of the Father,' and that they believe that the mode of this presence is not natural, corporeal, carnal, in itself local, &c., but without any departure from heaven and supernatural."*

"Enormous is the error of the more rigid Protestants who deny that Christ is to be adored in the Eucharist, save with an internal and mental adoration, but not with any outward rite of worship, as by kneeling or some other similar position of the body. They, with few exceptions, hold wrong views concerning of Christ the Lord in the Sacrament, Who is present in a wonderful but true manner.

"Whether we adore Christ, Who is most present in the Eucharist, standing or sitting, looking downwards or upwards, erect or upon our knees, with outstretched or clasped hands, does not indeed affect the adoration itself, but rather belongs to times and seasons and that kind of circumstances,' as Claude Espencée rightly says. But to condemn as unlawful the outward gesture of adoration which almost all Christians, from the very times of the Apostles, have observed, either standing or bending on their knees, in receiving the Eucharist (and do observe even at the present day), is assuredly an act of great rashness and audacity."†

"Wrongly do many Protestants object that Romanists are worshippers of bread, and accuse and condemn them for very gross and grievous idolatry; since most Romanists (as well as others of the faithful) believe that the consecrated bread is no longer bread, but only (from a supposition, which, though false, is not heretical, nor impious, nor directly repugnant to the faith, as has been shown in the former book) the body of Christ, which is truly to be adored. For they themselves teach that in the Eucharist 'we must in our minds distinguish Christ from the visible sign,' and that Christ indeed is to be adored, but not the sacrament, because these species are created and inanimate things, and consequently incapable of adoration; for it is not sufficient that Christ be under them, 'because God is in the soul also, as in His temple, and yet God is adored and not the soul,' as Suarez says."‡

"Concerning the adoration of the Eucharist, I think that we should thus define it in accordance with the belief of the ancients. Since in this sacrament Christ, Who is both God and man, makes

* Ibid., p. 423, 28.

† Ibid., p. 545.

‡ Ibid., p. 549.

Himself present both by His body and His blood, it follows that He should be adored in this mystery also; which adoration is to be referred not to the sign itself, which is outwardly visible, but to the very thing and truth which is believed inwardly; although to the sign itself (whose power is now perceived by the understanding) its proper veneration is also due, as being religious and sacred.' This most true opinion of his, he confirms by evidence from the fathers, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine imitating him, St. Chrysostom, Theodoret. 'The mystical symbols, says Theodoret, are understood to be those things which they have been made, and are believed and adored as being those things which they are believed to be.' Thus Cassander, in his section upon the adoration of the Eucharist."*

"But that this sacrifice of the Lord's Supper is not only propitiatory, and that the Lord's body can be offered in the aforesaid manner for the forgiveness of the sins which are daily committed by us, but is, moreover, impetratory of blessings of every kind, and is even rightly offered for them, although the Scriptures do not clearly and expressly say this, yet the fathers with unanimous agreement have so understood the Scriptures, as has been proved at length by others; and all ancient Liturgies repeatedly enjoin that while the offering is going on, prayer should be made for peace, for abundance of the fruits of the ground, and for other temporal blessings of the same sort, as is known to every one.

"Francis White, now Bishop of Ely: 'Touching the name and title of sacrifice, our Church giveth the same to the Holy Eucharist; and that, not only in respect of certain pious actions annexed unto it, to wit, prayer, thanksgiving, alms, &c.; but in regard of the Eucharist itself, wherein, first, the outward elements of bread and wine receiving the calling of God (as Irenæus expresses it) are made sacred, and appointed to divine worship, and become instruments of grace to men. Secondly, the body and blood of Christ, present to the soul'—this expression is too meagre—'are by the faith and devotion of the pastor and people which receive these mysteries presented and tendered to God, with request, that He will vouchsafe for the merit thereof, to bestow grace and remission of sins and other benefits upon them.'"[†]

"As to what is so often said in this chapter, that the sacrifice

* Ibid., p. 553.

† Ibid., p. 607.

which is performed in the Supper, is not merely Eucharistic, but also in a sound sense propitiatory, and is profitable to very many, not only of the living, but of the departed also.”*

CHILLINGWORTH (1602–1644) is reckoned “the best reasoner and most acute logician of his time.” He was educated at Trinity, joined the Roman communion and went to Douay, returned to England and the English Church, and was made Prebendary of Salisbury.

Dr. Pusey says, page 105 of the Preface:—

“I cannot quote Chillingworth as a representative of the Church of England, I fear that he died an Arian. It is, however, not a little remarkable that he accepted the writings of the best times of the Primitive Church ‘as the safest interpreter of Scripture.’ For in that case he would not be far from the rule of Vincent of Lerins, the ‘quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.’ But now those who have ever in their mouths his and their favorite maxim, ‘The Bible and the Bible only the religion of Protestants,’ will do well to consider what he derived purely from Holy Scripture, where those so hot against us find nothing. The author of ‘The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation,’ in his sermon† makes this appeal:—

“‘This truth being so evident in Scripture and in the writings of the ancient best times of the Primitive Church, the safest interpreters of Scripture, I make no question but there will not be found one person amongst you, who, when he shall be in a calm, impartial disposition, will offer to deny it. For, I beseech you, give yourselves leave impartially to examine your own thoughts. Can any man be so unreasonable as once to imagine with himself, that when our Saviour, after His resurrection, having received, as Himself saith, all power in heaven and earth, having led captivity captive, came then to bestow gifts upon men; when He, I say, in so solemn a manner (having first breathed upon His disciples, thereby conveying and insinuating the Holy Ghost into their hearts), renewed unto them, or rather confirmed and sealed unto them, that glorious

* Ibid., p. 613.

† Works. Sermon VII. p. 634. Philadelphia edition, 1840.

commission, which before He had given to Peter, sustaining, as it were, the person of the whole Church, whereby He delegated to them an authority of binding and loosing sins upon earth, with a promise that the proceedings in the court of heaven should be directed and regulated by theirs on earth; can any man, I say, think so unworthily of our Saviour, as to esteem these words of His for no better than compliment? for nothing but court holy water?

“Yet so impudent have our adversaries of Rome been in their dealings with us, that they have dared to lay to our charge, as if we had so mean a conceit of our Saviour’s gift of the keys; taking advantage indeed from the unwary expressions of some particular divines, who, out of too forward a zeal against the Church of Rome, have bended their staff too much the contrary way; and instead of taking away that intolerable burden of a sacramental, necessary, universal confession, have seemed to void and frustrate all use and exercise of the keys.

“Since Christ, for your benefit and comfort, hath given such authority to His ministers, upon your unfeigned repentance and contrition to absolve and release you from your sins; why should I doubt, or be unwilling to exhort and persuade you to make your advantage of this gracious promise of our Saviour’s? Why should I envy you the participation of so heavenly a blessing? Truly, if I should deal thus with you, I should prove myself a malicious, unchristian-like malignant preacher; I should, wickedly and unjustly, against my own conscience, seek to defraud you of those glorious blessings which our Saviour hath intended for you.

“Therefore, in obedience to His gracious will, and as I am warranted, and even enjoined, by my holy mother the Church of England expressly, in the Book of Common Prayer, in the rubric of Visiting the Sick (which doctrine this Church hath likewise embraced so far), I beseech you, that by your practice and use, you will not suffer that commission, which Christ hath given to His ministers, to be a vain form of words, without any sense under them; to be an antiquated expired commission, of no use nor validity in these days; but whensoever you find yourselves charged and oppressed, especially with such crimes as they call “*peccata vastantia conscientiam*,” such as do lay waste and depopulate the conscience, that you would have recourse to your spiritual physician, and freely disclose the nature and malignancy of your disease, that he may be able, as the cause shall require, to proportion a remedy, either to search it with corrosives, or comfort and temper it with

oil. And come not to him only with such a mind as you would go to a learned man experienced in the Scriptures, as one that can speak comfortable, quieting words to you, but as to one that hath authority delegated to him from God Himself, to absolve and quit you of your sins. If you shall do this assure your souls, that the understanding of man is not able to conceive that transport and excess of joy and comfort, which shall accrue to that man's heart, that is persuaded that he hath been made partaker of this blessing orderly and legally according as our Saviour Christ hath prescribed.'”

The passage immediately preceding the portion quoted by Dr. Pusey is:—

“Give me therefore leave, I pray you, to give you the state of the question, and the doctrine of our Church, in the words of one, who both now is, and for ever will worthily be accounted, the glory of this kingdom [Archb. Usher] ‘Be it known (saith he) to our adversaries of Rome (I add, also, to our adversaries of even Great Britain, who sell their private fancies for the doctrine of our Church), that no kind of confession, either public or private, is disallowed by our Church, that is any way requisite for the due execution of that ancient power of the keys, which Christ bestowed upon His Church. The thing which we reject, is that new picklock of sacramental confession, obtruded upon men's consciences, as a matter necessary to salvation, by the canons of the late Conventicle of Trent, in the 14th Session.’”

HOLY EUCHARIST.

“An application to the Communion. I have hitherto, as carefully as so short a time would permit (and yet, it may be with greater earnestness than you could have been content I should) searched into the retired corners of our hearts, and there discovered a vice, which, it may be, you little expected, namely, atheism; a strange vice, I confess, to be found in Christian hearts. I have likewise exemplified in some particular practices of these times, most exactly contrary to our profession of Christian religion. If I should endeavour to discover all that might be observed of this nature, not my hour only, but the day itself would fail me. Notwithstanding I am resolved to make one instance more about the business for which we are met together, namely, the receiving of the blessed body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. I suppose you will all acknowledge with me, that that is a business of the greatest conse-

quence that a Christian is capable of performing. I hope I need not to instruct you, how inexcusably guilty those men render themselves, who come with an unprepared heart, with an unsanctified mouth, to the partaking of these heavenly mysteries. 'Who art thou (saith God by the Psalmist) that takest My word into thy mouth, when thou hated to be reformed?' And if that be so great a crime for a man only to talk of God, to make mention of His name, when the heart is unclean and unreformed, with how much greater reason may Christ say, What art thou that takest Me into thy mouth? What art thou that dardest devour My flesh, and suck My blood, that dardest incorporate My flesh and blood into thyself, to make my spotless body an instrument of thy lusts, a temple for the devil to inhabit and reign in? To crucify Christ once more, and put Him to an open shame? To crucify Him so that no good shall follow upon it, to make the blood of the new covenant a profane thing? And thus far, if not deeper is that man guilty, that shall dare to come to this heavenly feast with spotted and unclean affections."*

JOSEPH HALL, Bishop of Norwich 1641, was accused of being too lenient to the Puritans. He attended also the council of Dort. The Puritans, however, put him first into the Tower, from which he was released on £5000 bail. They then sent down to Norwich and sequestered his books and household goods, and exposed them for sale. One "Mrs. Goodwin, a religious, good gentlewoman," paid the sum at which the sequestrators appraised the goods—and "Mr. Cook, a worthy divine," bought in the books. After a little delay, one message after another was sent to dislodge him and his aged wife from the palace. Nothing would satisfy the committee who had charge of the matter but their leaving. "Out we must, says the bishop, and that in three weeks' warning, by midsummer day then approaching; so that we might have lien in the street for aught I know, had not the providence of God so ordered it that a neighbour in the Close, one Mr. Gostlin, a widower, was content to void his house for us. This hath been my measure; wherefore I know not: Lord, Thou knowest, Who only canst remedy and end and forgive or avenge this horrible oppression."

* Ibid. Philadelphia edition. Herman Hooker, 1840, p. 580.

This was in 1647. The good bishop died in 1656. He lived long enough to see the Puritans crushed down by the iron heel of the Protector.

His account of the destruction of Norwich Cathedral is too graphic to be omitted.

"It is no other than tragical to relate the carriage of that furious sacrilege whereof our eyes and ears were the sad witnesses, under the authority and presence of * * * * Lord, what work was here! what clattering of glasses! what beating down of walls! what tearing up of monuments! what pulling down of seats! what wresting out of irons and brass from windows and graves! what defacing of arms! what demolishing of curious stonework, that had not any representation in the world but only of the cost of the founder and the skill of the mason! what tooting and piping upon the destroyed organ pipes! and what a hideous triumph on the market day before all the country, when, in a kind of sacrilegious and profane procession, all the organ pipes, vestments, both copes and surplices, together with the leaden cross which had been newly sawn down from over the Greenyard pulpit, and the service books and singing books that could be had, were carried to the fire in the public market place; a lewd wretch walking before the train in his cope trailing in the dirt, with a service book in his hand, imitating in an impious scorn the tune, and usurping the words of the litany used formerly in the Church. Near the public cross all these monuments of idolatry must be sacrificed to the fire; not without much ostentation of a zealous joy, in discharging ordnance, to the cost of some who professed how much they had longed to see that day. Neither was it any news, upon this guild-day, to have the cathedral, now open on all sides, to be filled with musketeers, waiting for the major's return: drinking and tobacconing as freely as if it had turned ale house."*

CONFESSION.

"That there is a lawful, commendable, beneficial use of confession, was never denied by us."†

"Since our quarrel is not with confession itself, which may be of singular use and behoof; but with some tyrannous strains in the practice of it, which are the violent forcing and perfect fulness thereof; it shall be sufficient for us herein to stand upon our nega-

* Bishop Hall's *Hard Measure*. Works, Vol. I., lxviii.

† Bp. Hall, viii. 689.

tive, That there is no Scripture in the whole Book of God, wherein either such necessity or such entireness of confession is commanded; a truth so clear, that it is generally confessed by their own canonists.

"Did we question the lawfulness of confession, we should be justly accountable for our grounds from the Scriptures of God: now that we cry down only some injurious circumstances therein, well may we require from the fautors thereof their warrants from God; which if they cannot show, they are sufficiently convinced of a presumptuous obtrusion."*

HOLY EUCHARIST.

"Who shall now make doubt to say, that in the sacrament of the blessed Eucharist Christ is only present and received in a spiritual manner: so as nothing is objected to our senses but the elements; nothing but Christ to our faith? And therefore, that it is requisite we should here walk with a wary and even foot, as those that must tread in the midst, betwixt profaneness and superstition: not affixing a Deity upon the elements, on the one side; nor, on the other, slighting them with a common regard: not adoring the creatures; not basely esteeming their relation to that Son of God whom they do really exhibit to us?"†

"For geniculation [*i. e.* kneeling] in the Eucharist, I am deceived if ever ceremony could complain of a more unjust displeasure, or plead better desert.

"For the antiquity of it, those that fetch it from Honorius are ill heralds. They might know that Averroes, an age before him, could say, in a misprision of the gesture, '*Christiani adorant quod edunt;*' and the best of the Fathers, many ages before him, '*Nemo manducat nisi prius adoraverit.*'

"For the expedience, what business can pass betwixt heaven and earth, God and man, so worthy of reverence, as that wherein man receives God? Even the smallest gifts we receive from princes upon our knees; and now, when the Prince of our peace gives himself to us, shall we grudge to bow?

"I know the old challenge, Artolatry. But shall others' superstition make us unreverent? Shall not God have our knees, because idols have had the knees of others?"‡

* Works of J. Hall, Bp. of Norwich, ed. P. Wynter, 1863, VIII. 690.

† Bp. Hall, vol. viii. 774.

‡ Bp. Hall, vol. ix. 125.

"That the true body of Christ is truly offered and truly received in the Sacrament, which of us hath not ever constantly taught and defended? But how is this? Not by any bodily touch, as Cyril and Ambrose say well, but by our faith. That it should be corporally, carnally, orally present, and torn in pieces with our teeth, as good Pope Nicholas caused Berengarius to say, and our Allen hath followed him unbidden, hath ever seemed impious to us, and as Austin judges it, no less than flagitious."*

"That in this sacred supper there is a sacrifice in that sense wherein the fathers spake none of us ever doubted: but that is then either latrentical, as Bellarmine distinguishes it not ill, or eucharistical: there is here, as Chrysostom speaks, 'a remembrance of a sacrifice;' that is, as Augustine interprets it, a memorial of Christ's passion celebrated in the Church. And from this sweet commemoration of our redemption there arises another sacrifice, the sacrifice of praise; and from thence a true peace-offering of the Christian soul."†

JOHN BRAMHALL, Archbishop of Armagh 1660, was one of the most learned and most industrious prelates of his time. Impeached by the Irish parliament (1641) at the same time that the great Earl of Strafford was in England, his enemies with all their efforts could find nothing against him.

"Though all persons were encouraged to contribute to his ruin, they found little to object, but his endeavours to retrieve the ancient patrimony of the Church. Notwithstanding they examined all his actions with severity, they could not fix the least tincture of private advantage on him; none of his relations, family, or friends, being one farthing the richer for anything he had recovered to the Church."

He was finally released through the influence of Archbishop Usher. Usher writes:—

"My lord Strafford the night before his suffering (which was most Christian and magnanimous *ad stuporem usque*), sent me to the King, giving me in charge among other particulars to put him in mind of you, and of the other two lords that are under the same pressure."

* Bp. Hall, x. 384.

† Bp. Hall, x. 387.

Bramhall's works were republished in five volumes in the Anglo-Catholic Library, in 1842.

CONFESSION.

"We acknowledge that he who is ordained is enabled by his office many ways to put away sins. * * * 5. By special absolution; 'Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted.' To forgive sins is no more proper to God, than to work wonders above the course of nature. The one is communicable as the other. The priest absolves; or, to say more properly, God absolves by the priest. Therefore he saith, 'I absolve thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' God remits sovereignly, imperially, primitively, absolutely; the priest's power is derivative, delegate, dependent, ministerial, conditional. It is true, the Protestants differ among themselves, whether the absolution of the priest be declarative or operative; that is, about the manner. And so do the Romanists likewise one with another. Yea, I dare say, that their schools do scarcely ever run more into division than about this."*

"Neither have the Protestants 'pared away' all manner of shrift, or confession and absolution. I have showed before in this answer five several ways, whereby the Protestants hold that their Presbyters put away sins. Nay, they condemn not private confession and absolution itself, as an ecclesiastical policy, to make men more wary how they offend; so as it might be left free, without tyrannical imposition. No better physic for a full stomach than a vomit. Bodily sores do sometimes compel a man to put off natural shamefacedness, and to offer his less comely parts to the view of the chirurgion. By a little shame, which we suffer before our fellow servant, we prevent that great confusion of face, which otherwise must fall upon impenitent sinners at the Day of Judgment."†

HOLY EUCHARIST.

"Thus far we accord, to the truth of the presence of Christ's body and blood, so they leave us this latitude for the manner of His presence. Abate us transubstantiation, and those things which are consequents of their determination of the manner of Presence, and we have no difference with them in this particular.

* Works, v. 213.

† Ibid., v. 222.

They who are ordained priests ought to have power to consecrate the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, that is, to make them present after such manner as they were present at the first institution; whether it be done by enunciation of the words of Christ, as it is observed in the Western Church, or by prayer, as it is practised in the Eastern Church; or whether these two be both the same thing in effect, that is, that the forms of the sacraments be mystical prayers and implicit invocations. Our Church, for more abundant caution, useth both forms, as well in the consecration of the sacrament as in the ordination of priests. In the Holy Eucharist, our consecration is a repetition of that which was done by Christ, and now done by him that consecrateth in the person of Christ; otherwise the priest could not say, 'This is my body.' And likewise in Episcopal consecration, 'Man imposeth hands, God conferreth grace, the bishop imposeth his suppliant right hand, God blesseth with his Almighty right hand.' In both consecrations Christ Himself is the chief consecrator still. Then, if power of consecration be nothing else but power to do that which Christ did, and ordained to be done, our priests want not power to consecrate."*

"Secondly, in these words, 'Whose sins thou dost remit they are remitted;' that is, not only by priestly absolution, but by preaching, by baptizing, by administering the Holy Eucharist, which is a means to apply the all-sufficient sacrifice of Christ for the remission of sins."†

"For all the essentials of their sacrifice are contained in our celebration of the Holy Eucharist; that is, according to their schools, the consecration, and consumption of the whole or part. Both these we have as well as they; the former more purely than they, the latter more eminently than they; inasmuch as with us both priest and people do receive, with them the priest only. It was therefore truly said by the learned Bishop of Ely [Andrewes' answer to Bellarmine], 'Take away your transubstantiation, and we shall have no difference about sacrifice.'"‡

"They acknowledge a commemoration, or a representative sacrifice, in the Holy Eucharist. They teach that this is not 'a bare commemoration' without efficacy, but that the blessed sacrament

* Works of J. Bramhall, Archp. of Armagh (Anglo-Catholic), iii., 165.

† Ibid., 167.

‡ Ibid., v. 217.

is a means ordained by Christ to render us capable, and to apply unto us the virtue of that all-sufficient sacrifice of infinite value which Christ made upon the Cross. But [they] dare not say that the Holy Eucharist is a sacrifice propitiatory in itself, by its own proper virtue and expiatory efficacy. Whatsoever power it hath, is in relation to the sacrifice of Christ, as a means ordained to apply that to true believers."*

JEREMY TAYLOR, Bishop of Down and Connor 1660, eloquent and learned, vast in his acquirements, omnivorous in his studies, diligent to give to others what God had given him to know himself, industrious and indefatigable, persecuted by the Puritans, loved and revered by their descendants, a man of many sides, wise to teach, to exhort, to comfort, and to delight, what do not myriads of loving and humble souls owe to him!

"Bishop Taylor," says Dr. Rust in his funeral sermon, "had the good humour of the gentleman, the eloquence of an orator, the fancy of a poet, the acuteness of a schoolman, the profoundness of a philosopher, the wisdom of a chancellor, the sagacity of a prophet, the reason of an angel, and the piety of a saint." Add to this, that he had the tender and loving and feeling heart of a man, and you have his character in full.

CONFESSION.

"Confession to a priest, the minister of pardon and reconciliation, the curate of souls, and the guide of consciences, is of so great use and benefit to all that are heavy laden with their sins, that they who carelessly and causelessly neglect it, are neither lovers of the peace of consciences, nor are careful for the advantages of their souls."†

"It is a very pious preparation to the holy sacrament, that we confess our sins to the minister of religion: for since it is necessary that a man be examined, and a self-examination was prescribed to the Corinthians in the time of their lapsed discipline, that though there were divisions among them, and no established gov-

* Ibid., v. p. 221.

† Of Ecclesiastical Penance. Works, ed. Heber, vol. ix. p. 250.

errors, yet from this duty they were not to be excused; and they must, in destitution of a public minister, do it themselves (but this is in case only of such necessity); the other is better; that is, it is of better order and more advantage, that this part of repentance and holy preparation be performed under the conduct of a spiritual guide. And the reason is pressing. For since it is life or death that is there administered, and the great dispensation of the keys is in that ministry, it were very well, if he that ministers did know whether the person presented were fit to communicate or no: and if he be not, it is charity to reject him, and charity to assist him that he may be fitted. There are many sad contingencies in the constitution of ecclesiastical affairs, in which every man that needs this help, and would fain make use of it, cannot; but when he can meet with the blessing, it were well it were more frequently used, and more readily entertained.”*

HOLY EUCHARIST.

“Upon the strength of the premises, we may sooner take an estimate of the graces which are conveyed to us, in the reception and celebration of this holy sacrament and sacrifice. For, as it is a commemoration and representment of Christ’s death, so it is a commemorative sacrifice; as we receive the symbols and the mystery, so it is a sacrament. In both capacities, the benefit is next to infinite. First: for whatsoever Christ did at the institution, the same he commanded the church to do, in remembrance and repeated rites; and himself also does the same thing in heaven for us, making perpetual intercession for his church, the body of his redeemed ones, by representing to his Father his death and sacrifice. There he sits, a high priest continually, and offers still the same one perfect sacrifice; that is, still represents it as having been once finished and consummate, in order to perpetual and never-failing events. And this, also, his ministers do on earth; they offer up the same sacrifice to God, the sacrifice of the cross, by prayers, and a commemorating rite and representment, according to his holy institution. And as all the effects of grace and the titles of glory were purchased for us on the cross, and the actual mysteries of redemption perfected on earth, but are applied to us, and made effectual to single persons and communities of men, by Christ’s intercession in heaven; so also they are promoted by acts of duty and religion here on earth, that we may be ‘workers

* Ibid., p. 299.

together with God' (as St. Paul expresses it), and in virtue of the eternal and all-sufficient sacrifice may offer up our prayers and our duty; and by representing that sacrifice, may send up, together with our prayers, an instrument of their graciousness and acceptance. * * * *

"As Christ is a priest in heaven forever, and yet does not sacrifice himself afresh, nor yet without a sacrifice could he be a priest, but, by a daily ministration and intercession, represents his sacrifice to God, and offers himself as sacrificed: so he does upon earth, by the ministry of his servants; he is offered to God, that is, he is, by prayers and the sacrament, represented or 'offered up to God as sacrificed;' which, in effect, is a celebration of his death, and the applying it to the present and future necessities of the church, as we are capable, by a ministry like to his in heaven. It follows, then, that the celebration of this sacrifice be, in its proportion, an instrument of applying the proper sacrifice to all the purposes which it first designed. It is ministerially, and by application, an instrument propitiatory; it is eucharistical, it is an homage, and an act of adoration; and it is impetratory, and obtains for us, and for the whole church, all the benefits of the sacrifice which is now celebrated and applied; that is, as this rite is the remembrance and ministerial celebration of Christ's sacrifice, so it is destined to do honour to God, to express the homage and duty of his servants, to acknowledge his supreme dominion, to give him thanks and worship, to beg pardon, blessings, and supply of all our needs. And its profit is enlarged, not only to the persons celebrating, but to all to whom they design it, according to the nature of sacrifices and prayers, and all such solemn actions of religion."*

"It is the greatest solemnity of prayer, the most powerful liturgy and means of impetration, in this world. For when Christ was consecrated on the cross, and became our High Priest, having reconciled us to God by the death of the cross, he became infinitely gracious in the eyes of God, and was admitted to the celestial and eternal priesthood in heaven; where, in the virtue of the cross, he intercedes for us, and represents an eternal sacrifice in the heavens on our behalf. That he is a priest in heaven, appears in the large discourses and direct affirmatives of St. Paul. That there is no other sacrifice to be offered but that on the cross, it is evident, because 'he hath but once appeared in the end of the world to put

* Life of Christ, Discourse XIX., 7. Works, vol. iii. p. 296.

away sin by the sacrifice of himself;' and therefore since it is necessary that he hath something to offer so long as he is a priest, and there is no other sacrifice but that of himself offered upon the cross, it follows that Christ, in heaven, perpetually offers and represents that sacrifice to his heavenly Father, and, in virtue of that, obtains all good things for his church.

"Now what Christ does in heaven, he hath commanded us to do on earth; that is, to represent his death, to commemorate this sacrifice, by humble prayer and thankful record; and by faithful manifestation and joyful eucharist, to lay it before the eyes of our heavenly father, so ministering in his priesthood, and doing according to his commandment and his example; the church being the image of heaven; the priest, the minister of Christ; the holy table being a copy of the celestial altar; and the eternal sacrifice of the Lamb slain from the beginning of the world being always the same; it bleeds no more after the finishing of it on the cross, but it is wonderfully represented in heaven and graciously represented here; by Christ's action there, by his commandment here. And the event of it is plainly this—that as Christ, in virtue of his sacrifice on the cross, intercedes for us with his Father, so does the minister of Christ's priesthood here; that the virtue of the eternal sacrifice may be salutary and effectual to all the needs of the church, both for things temporal and eternal. And, therefore, it was not without great mystery and clear signification, that our blessed Lord was pleased to command the representation of his death and sacrifice on the cross should be made by breaking bread and effusion of wine; to signify to us the nature and sacredness of the liturgy we are about, and that we minister in the priesthood of Christ, who is a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec; that is, we are ministers in that unchangeable priesthood, imitating, in the external ministry, the prototype Melchisedec; of whom it was said, 'He brought forth bread and wine, and was the priest of the most high God;' and, in the internal, imitating the antitype, or the substance, Christ himself; who offered up his body and blood for atonement for us, and, by the sacraments of bread and wine, and the prayers of oblation and intercession, commands us to officiate in his priesthood, in the external ministering like Melchisedec, in the internal after the manner of Christ himself.

"This is a great and a mysterious truth, which as it is plainly manifested in the Epistle to the Hebrews, so it is understood by the ancient and holy doctors of the church."*

* Taylor, *The Worthy Communicant*, Section IV., 4. Works, vol. xv. p. 437.

GILBERT BURNET, Bishop of Salisbury 1689, is too well known to need any words here. A latitudinarian in his creed, no great clearness or precision need be expected of him, in his expression of doctrine. Still, as compared with some modern teachers, he would rank as an extreme churchman. I have already given one or two extracts from him in the body of this essay, and now subjoin two more.

CONFESSION.

“And as a mean to quiet men’s consciences, to direct them to complete their repentance, and to make them more humble and ashamed of their sins, we advise them to use secret confession to their priest, or to any other minister of God’s word, leaving this matter wholly to their discretion.”*

“The writer once saw in a collection of autographs (which he has not since succeeded in tracing) a letter from Bishop Burnet, signed by him, in reply to another bishop, whose name is not stated. The latter had written to inquire what form of Absolution he (Burnet) used when persons came to confess to him. He (the inquirer) had said that he was in the habit of using that in the office for the sick, but wished to know what was Burnet’s practice. The reply of the latter was this: That in his opinion, either was proper, but that he himself used that in the office for Holy Communion.”†

HOLY EUCHARIST.

“These words have a sense and signification that rises far above a mere ceremony done to keep up order, and to maintain a settled form. The phrase ‘communion of the body and blood of Christ,’ is above the nature of an anniversary, or memorial feast. This opinion we think is very unsuitable to those high expressions; and we do not doubt but that Christ, Who instituted those sacraments, does still accompany them with a particular presence in them, and a blessing upon them; so that we, coming to them with minds well prepared, with pure affections and holy resolutions, do certainly receive in and with them particular largesses of the favour and bounty of God. They are not bare and naked remembrances

* Burnet, Art. XXV., p. 355.

† John D. Chambers, Recorder of Salisbury, in *The Church and the World*, second series, 1867, page 393.

and tokens; but are actuated and animated by a divine blessing that attends upon them. This is what we believe on this head, and these are the grounds upon which we found it. A sacrament is an institution of Christ, in which some material thing is sanctified by the use of some form or words, in and by which federal acts of this religion do pass on both sides; on ours, by stipulations, professions, or vows; and on God's by His secret assistances; by these we are also united to the body of Christ, which is the Church."*

JOHN TILLOTSON was made Archbishop of Canterbury in 1691, on the refusal of Archbishop Sancroft to take the oaths. He was a latitudinarian in doctrine, and we cannot expect to find in his writings any very strong or clearly expressed dogmatic statements. He was of a kind and forgiving disposition, and was in great favour with William III. His sermons were long held in great estimation, though now probably little read.

CONFESSION.

"I proceed to the second inquiry, namely, how far the disclosing and revealing our sins to the Ministers of God may be convenient upon other accounts, and to other purposes of religion? To which the answer is very plain and short; so far as is necessary either to the direction, or the ease of men's consciences.

"There are many cases wherein men, under the guilt and trouble of their sins, can neither appease their own minds, nor sufficiently direct themselves, without recourse to some pious and prudent guide; in these cases men certainly do very well, and many times prevent a great deal of trouble and perplexity to themselves, by a timely discovery of their condition to some faithful minister, in order to their direction and satisfaction, without which they shall never perhaps be able to clear themselves of the obscurity and entanglement of their own minds, but by smothering their trouble in their own breasts, shall proceed from one degree of melancholy to another, till at last they be plunged either in distraction or despair; whereas the discovery of their condition in time would prove a present and effectual remedy. And to this purpose a general confession is for the most part sufficient; and where there is occasion for a more particular discovery, there is no need of raking into the

* Ibid., page 349.

particular and foul circumstances of men's sins to give that advice which is necessary for the cure and ease of the penitent; a thing so far from being desirable that it must needs be very grievous to every modest and good man.

"And thus far confession is not only allowed, but encouraged among Protestants. In the Lutheran churches, Chemnitius tells us that private general confession is in use and practice. And Calvin freely declares, that he is so far from being against people's repairing to their pastors to this purpose, that he earnestly wisheth it were everywhere observed before the receiving of the Sacrament. And the same is the sense of our own Church, laying no necessity upon men in this matter, but advising, especially before the Sacrament, those who have any trouble upon their consciences, to repair to some discreet and faithful minister of God's word for advice and satisfaction. And thus all the good use, which can be made of confession, may be had in the Church, without an ill effect, and consequences of the Romish confession, and without laying a yoke upon the consciences of men, which our Saviour never laid."*

"As for our confessing our sins to men, both Scripture and reason do in some cases recommend and enjoin it, as * * * *

"2. Confession of our sins to men is likewise reasonable, in order to the ease and satisfaction of our minds, and our being directed in our duty for the future. In this case common reason and prudence, without any precept of Scripture, will direct men to have recourse to this remedy, viz.: to discover and lay open our disease to some skilful spiritual physician, to some faithful friend or prudent guide, in order to spiritual advice and direction, for the peace and satisfaction of our minds. And then

"3. In case our sins have been public and scandalous, both reason and the practice of the Christian Church do require, that when men have publicly offended, they should give public satisfaction, and open testimony of their repentance.

"But as for private and auricular confession of our sins to a priest in all cases, and as of absolute necessity to our obtaining pardon and forgiveness from God, as the Church of Rome teacheth, this is neither necessary by divine precept, nor by any Constitution and practice of the ancient Christian Church, as I have shown in my former discourse."†

* Tillotson, Sermon CVI., Works ed. 1713, vol. 2, page 12.

† Ibid., Sermon CVII. page 18.

HOLY EUCHARIST.

"We are likewise obliged hereunto in point of interest. The benefits which we expect to be derived and assured to us by this Sacrament are all the blessings of the New Covenant, the forgiveness of our sins, the grace and assistance of God's Holy Spirit, to enable us to perform the conditions of this covenant required on our part: and the comforts of God's Holy Spirit to encourage us in well-doing, and to support us under sufferings; and the glorious reward of eternal life. So that in neglecting this Sacrament we neglect our own interest and happiness, we forsake our own mercies, and judge ourselves unworthy of all the blessings of the Gospel, and deprive ourselves of one of the best means and advantages of confirming and conveying these blessings to us. So that if we had not a due sense of our duty, the consideration of our own interest should oblige us not to neglect so excellent and so effectual a means of promoting our own comfort and happiness."*

WILLIAM WAKE, Archbishop of Canterbury 1716, is best known in this country by his translation of the Apostolic fathers, which has been often reprinted here. The copy I have was published at Hartford, 1834.

His biographer says of him: "Although on principle averse to the proposed abolition of the Test acts, yet his liberality towards dissenters from the Church, and his earnest endeavours to effect a union between the Churches of England and France, were deserving as much of praise as they produced him vituperation from those who either misunderstood, or wilfully misrepresented his motives and conduct." "His controversial writings, which are numerous, though nervously written, betray no acrimony; the principal of these are his reply to the celebrated Bossuet, &c. &c." His tracts against Bossuet were reprinted in Bishop Gibson's *Preservative against Popery*, 3 vols. folio, 1738—18 vols. octavo, 1848.

From them I make a few extracts.

CONFESSION.

"The Church of England refuses no sort of confession either publick or private, which may be any way necessary to the quieting

* Works of Archb. Tillotson, 5th ed., 1707, page 285.

of men's consciences; or to the exercising of that power of binding and loosing, which our Saviour Christ has left to His Church.

"We have our penitential Canons for publick offenders: we exhort men if they have any the least doubt or scruple, nay sometimes though they have none, but especially before they receive the Holy Sacrament, to confess their sins. We propose to them the benefits not only of ghostly advice how to manage their repentance, but the great comfort of Absolution too, as soon as they shall have completed it. * * * *

"When we visit our sick, we never fail to exhort them to make a special confession of their sins to him that ministers to them; and when they have done it, the Absolution is so full, that the Church of Rome itself could not desire to add anything to it."*

HOLY EUCHARIST.

"This consecration being separately made of his Body broken, his Blood spilt for our Redemption, we suppose represents to us our Blessed Lord in the figure of his Death, which these Holy Symbols were instituted to continue the memory of. And while thus with Faith we represent to God the Death of his Son, for the pardon of our sins; we are persuaded, that we incline his mercy the more readily to forgive them. We do not therefore doubt, but that this presenting to God Almighty the Sacrifice of our Blessed Lord is a most effectual manner of applying his Merits to us. Were this all the Church of Rome meant by her Propitiatory Sacrifice, there is not certainly any Protestant that would oppose her in it."†

"These are the words of our church, and the meaning is clearly this: Christ is really present in this sacrament, inasmuch as they who worthily receive, have thereby really conveyed to them our Saviour Christ, and all the benefits of that body and blood, whereof the bread and wine are the outward signs. This great effect plainly shows it to be more than a mere figure; yet is it not His body after the manner that the papists imagine, 'Christ's body being in heaven, and not on the holy table;' and it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one.

"The sacramental bread and wine then remain still in their very

* An exposition of the doctrine of the Church of England in the several articles proposed by Monsieur de Meaux, late Bishop of Condom. (Bossuet) 1686. Philadelphia Library, 949 Q. 1, page 42.

† Ibid., p. 62.

natural substance: nor is there any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood at the holy altar: The presence we allow is spiritual, * * * * and yet it is real too: the bread which we receive, being a most real and effectual communion of Christ's body, in that spiritual and heavenly manner which St. Paul speaks of, and in which the faithful by their faith are made partakers of it. Thus doth our church admit of a real presence, &c. &c."*

"How little the doctrine of the real presence, as understood by the Church of England, will serve to support this innovation, is at first sight evident from the exposition I before gave of it. That those who are ordained priests, ought to have power given them to consecrate the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, and make them present in that holy Eucharist, after such a manner as our Saviour appointed, and as at the first institution of this sacred mystery they certainly were, this we have always confessed; and our rituals show that our priests accordingly have such a power, by imposition of hands, conferred on them."†

"Though Christ be acknowledged to be really present after a divine and heavenly manner in this holy Eucharist, yet will not this warrant the adoration of the host, which is still nevertheless only bread and wine, from being what our church censures it, idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians: nor will such a real presenting of our blessed Lord to His Father to render Him propitious to us, make the Eucharist any more than a metaphorical, not a true and proper propitiatory sacrifice."‡

How Wake's celebrated opponent thought, this extract will show:—

"The famous *test oath* well deserves to have a place in this history, since it has been one of the principal acts of religion in England. Here it is as it was adopted by the Parliament held at London in 1678: 'I, A. B., do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do believe that in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof, by any person whatsoever; and that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the Mass, as

* Wake, *A Defence of the Exposition*, &c., 949, Q. 5, p. 60.

† *Ibid.*, p. 68.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous.'

"What is peculiar in this profession of faith is, first that it attacks only Transubstantiation, and not the Real Presence, in which it follows the correction which Elizabeth made in the reform of Edward VI. These words only are added, 'at or after the consecration,' which manifestly allow a belief in the real presence before eating, since as we see they only exclude the change of substance. So that an Englishman, who is a good Protestant, may, without wounding his religion and his conscience, believe that the body and blood of Jesus Christ are really and substantially present in the bread and wine immediately after the consecration. If the Lutherans believed as much, it is certain they would adore. The English likewise do not oppose it in their test oath: and as they receive the Eucharist on their knees, nothing hinders them from recognizing and adoring Jesus Christ present therein, in the same spirit that we do. After that to lay a stress upon transubstantiation is a quibble little worthy of them."*

JOSEPH BINGHAM, the learned and laborious author of the "*Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, or the Antiquities of the Christian Church," was born in 1688, and died in 1723, the year after the completion of his great work.

CONFESSION.

"So that the use and advantage of spiritual guides in such a case sufficiently discovers the reasonableness and necessity of making application to them, in order to obtain the benefit and comfort of a particular declaratory absolution."†

HOLY EUCHARIST.

"But the ancients sometimes say, they worshipped Christ in the Eucharist; which we do not deny neither. St. Austin says: No man eats the flesh of Christ, but he that first worships it. And there are like expressions in Ambrose, Chrysostom, and some other ancient writers. But then, they sufficiently explain their own meaning, giving us to understand that they neither speak of

* Bossuet Variations, XIV., cxxil.

† Bingham, Sermon II., 2. Appendix. Works, vol. 2, p. 1110.

oral manducation, nor of adoring Christ as corporeally present in the Eucharist, but as spiritually present, or else as corporeally absent in heaven. * * * *

"All which directly overthrow the corporeal presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and consequently show that the adoration which was given to Christ in the Eucharist, was not to His corporeal presence, but His spiritual presence, or to His body as absent in heaven."*

"Above this was the power of offering up to God the people's sacrifices at the altar; that is, as Mr. Meade and others explain them, first the Eucharistical oblations of bread and wine, to agnize or acknowledge God to be the Lord of the creatures; then the sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving in commemoration of Christ's bloody sacrifice upon the Cross, mystically represented in the creatures of bread and wine; which whole sacred action was commonly called the Christian's reasonable and unbloody sacrifice, or the sacrifice of the altar."†

"But for their own mystical unbloody sacrifice, as they called the Eucharist, they always owned they had an altar, which they scrupled not to term indifferently *θυσιαστήριον*, *ara*, *altare*, and sometimes *βωμος*."‡

Bingham is wrong, the Christian altar is always *θυσιαστήριον*, never *βωμος*.

JOSEPH BUTLER, one of the greatest glories of the English race, author of "The Analogy of Religion," was consecrated Bishop of Bristol in 1738, and of Durham in 1750.

While Bishop of Bristol, he rebuilt at his own expense the Episcopal palace—the income of the See was £500—and repaired the private chapel.

"The altar piece, *i. e.*, reredos, says an eye-witness, writing in 1746, is of black marble, inlaid with a milk-white cross of white marble, which is plain and has a good effect. In the East Window over it is a small crucifix, with the blessed Virgin and St. John

* Bingham, *Antiquities*, Book XV., ch. 5. Bohn's edition, 1846, page 819 of vol. 2.

† *Ibid.*, Book II., sec.*15, vol. 1, p. 82.

‡ *Ibid.*, Book VIII., sec. 13, vol. 1, 301.

under the Cross weeping, of old glass; and not very curious. Over the new door into the chapel from the Hall, in a void space made on purpose, is a very old Coat of glass of the arms of Berkly ensigned with a mitre; and this is another reason to make one think that the old Abbey of Bristol gave these Arms to their founder for their own Coat. I was pleased to find the present bishop paid such a regard to the memory of the ancient abbey and its founders as to preserve this old memorial of them with so much care and precaution.”*

The customary and “time-honoured” cry of Popery was at once raised, and there was a great deal of bitterness, malice, and hate manifested.

This was not allayed by the Charge which he made to the clergy of Durham on his translation to that See. This Charge was on the importance of external religion.

“Our reformers,” he says, “considering that some of these observances were in themselves wrong and superstitious, and others of them made subservient to the purposes of superstition, abolished them, reduced the form of religion to great simplicity, and enjoined no more particular rules, nor left anything more of what was external in religion, than was in a manner necessary to preserve a sense of religion itself upon the minds of the people. But a great part of this is neglected by the generality amongst us; for instance, the service of the church, not only upon common days, but also upon saints’ days; and several other things might be mentioned. Thus they have no customary admonition, no public call to recollect the thoughts of God and religion from one Sunday to another.”†

No wonder, then, that when he died in the year following (1752), his enemies declared that he died in the communion of the Church of Rome. A further proof of which, if more were wanted, is the following passage from the same charge:—

“And as parents should be admonished, and it should be pressed upon their consciences to teach their children their prayers and Catechism, it being what they are obliged to upon all accounts; so it is proper to be mentioned here, as a means by which they will bring the principles of Christianity often to their own minds, instead of laying aside all thoughts of it from week’s end to week’s end.”‡

* Some Remains (hitherto unpublished) of Joseph Butler, &c. London, 1853, p. 24. This is a pamphlet of 32 pages.

† Works, vol. 2, p. 374.

‡ Ibid., p. 378.

None of his extant writings touch on the subjects of Confession and the Holy Eucharist; but he conducted public worship with all the solemnity and pomp in his power; he urged his clergy to see to the proper care of their churches; he set the example by repairing and beautifying his own chapel, and he was called a Papist in his lifetime and after his death. His biographer has to be at some pains to show that this accusation is not true, so entirely had the idea of the Catholicity of the Church of England and of the antiquity of her usages died out among the people, until it was revived again in our own day.

The Puritans and the Puritan side of the question have small claim on Joseph Butler. He gives his opinion of them, in the following passage, in a sermon preached on the 30th of January, 1740-1.

“In the history which this day refers us to, we find our Constitution, in Church and State, destroyed under pretences, not only of religion, but of securing liberty, and carrying it to a greater height. The destruction of the former was with zeal of such a kind as would not have been warrantable, though it had been employed in the destruction of heathenism. And the confusions, the persecuting spirit, and incredible fanaticism, which grew up upon its ruins, cannot but teach sober-minded men to reverence so mild and reasonable an establishment, now it is restored; for the preservation of Christianity, and keeping up a sense of it amongst us, and for the instruction and guide of the ignorant; nay, were it only for guarding religion from such extravagancies; especially as these important purposes are served by it without bearing hard in the least upon any.”*

NOTE.—Any one who wishes a real treat will find it in the good bishop's sermon “Upon the government of the tongue.”

* Ibid., p. 290.

RICHARD MONTAGUE.

RICHARD MONTAGUE, one of the most learned and devoted sons the Church of England ever had, was deeply read in theology and history, wide and extensive in his acquirements, accurate and ready in his instructions, somewhat sharp and cutting, as the fashion of that age was, with his pen. He won himself many friends among the true followers of the Catholic teaching of our Church, and also fierce, and bitter, and unrelenting enemies among the Calvinistic, lawless, restless, Puritanic enemies of that teaching. Standing in the forefront of God's army, he was the object of hate, and malignity, and falsehood, as was natural. But he was equal to the occasions. Being summoned shortly before his death to answer before parliament, he was too weak to appear. But for this he too would have been judicially murdered, as his great contemporary, Laud, was. But God took him. He died in 1641. "The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and there shall no torment touch them. In the sight of the unwise they seemed to die: and their departure is taken for misery, and their going from us to be utter destruction: but they are in peace."*

In 1621 Montague published his treatise on the Invocation of Saints, to relieve some false impressions derived from a sermon of his, preached before the king. As usual, this was without success. For never yet was any one convinced against his will. In the same year his answer to Selden's book on "Tithes"† fixed his reputation for learning and ability, but

* Wisdom, iii. 1.

† "It appears," says Chalmers, "by this work—Answer to Selden—that Mr. Montague availed himself of many MSS. which he had been at the expense of procuring from abroad. And it is said that there were a great many of them in his library when he died, but that they were taken away by Millicent, his chaplain, who became a Jesuit."

See, for an abstract of Montague's argument, Collier, viii. 397, ed. 1852.

must have been very obnoxious to the Puritan leaders. In 1624 a controversy with certain Romish emissaries who were meddling in his parish, involved him in fresh and unexpected troubles. In his "A gag for the new Gospel? No, a new gag for an old goose,"* he successfully refuted and overturned their arguments by setting forth plainly and clearly the Catholic teaching of the Church. He showed the antiquity and universality of her views and the modern and limited character of the views of his opponents. But these Catholic statements suited the Calvinists as little then as they do now. And they raised the familiar cry of *Popery*, and, what to them was at that time nearly as bad, *Arminianism*. They always have some pet horror. The Puritans appealed to parliament, that eminently fit tribunal for theological disputations. Montague getting wind of this, appealed to the king, in his "Appello Cæsarem," applying the words of Occam, to Lewis, emperor of Germany, "Lord emperor, defend me with thy sword, and I will defend thee with my pen." King James referred this book to Dr. Francis White, Dean of Carlisle, and on its receiving his approbation, allowed its publication, but died before it could be printed. It came out therefore under Charles I. The storm from the Puritans, became greater and greater, for Montague defended his positions with great skill and learning. The House of Commons took up the cudgels and summoned him before its bar. He was committed to the custody of the sergent-at-arms, and released only on giving security in two thousand pounds for his appearance. The Bishops of Oxford, Rochester, and St. Davids, applied to the king for a court of

* To secure his parishioners from the efforts of these men he challenged them to prove:—

1. That the present Roman Church is either the Catholic Church, or a sound member of it. 2. That the present Church of England is not a true member of it. 3. That all those points or any one of those points which the Church of Rome maintains against the Church of England were or was the perpetual doctrine of the Catholic Church. 4. The decided doctrine of the representative Church in any General Council. 5. Or national approved by a General Council. 6. Or the dogmatic resolution of any one Father for five hundred years after Christ. On their proving all these in the affirmative he promised to subscribe to their faith. Of course this challenge was not taken up. Instead of this a pamphlet was put forth, called "A new gag for the old Gospel." To which he replied with the one mentioned in the text.

inquiry. This was granted. On the meeting of the court, which was presided over by the Duke of Buckingham, Montague, who was absent from the city, was represented by John Cosin, who has left a very graphic account of the proceedings, which is printed in the second volume of his works.* Thomas Morton, Bishop of Lichfield, appeared as the chief accuser. He asserted that in the two books lately published, "The Gag" and "The Appeal," "were such gross errors, nay, heresies and blasphemies contained, as were not to be endured in a Christian commonwealth." And he proposed to make appear: 1. How, by publishing of these books, authority had been abused. 2. How the Articles and the religion of the Church of England had been opposed. 3. How no less than treason had been uttered, and both the oaths of supremacy and allegiance denied. 4. How apparent heresy had been maintained. 5. How the learned and worthy writings of our late sovereign lord king James had been rejected and vilified. 6. How the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ (which was a fearful thing to think) had been overthrown. 7. How a great gap had been opened both for popery to be brought in and get great increase among us, &c.

The proof of the first was that Montague inclined to the idea that the Turk was Antichrist rather than the pope, and had inserted the passage after the approbation given by the Dean. The Bishop of Rochester suggested that he, the Bishop of Lichfield, should show that the Church of England had ever determined this controversy. The Bishop of Lichfield, reluctantly giving it up, passed on to the second, and urged that Montague had contradicted Article XXI., when he affirmed that General Councils neither have erred nor can err. Here occurred a long debate; finally Mr. Cosin asked that Montague's words might be read, as every man was the best explainer of his own meaning. On the reading of certain passages the objection fell. The accusation of treason was founded on Montague's denying that a woman, *i. e.* Queen Elizabeth, may be supreme governess of the Church in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as temporal, as it was asserted. Mr. Cosin again read Montague's words.

* Anglo-Catholic Library.

"We say princes have supreme power in earth under God over all persons in all causes whatsoever within their dominions, even in causes merely ecclesiastical, to compel them to do their duties by the civil sword, &c."

"So that this accusation, quoth my lord duke, might have been spared, for we are all of Mr. Montague's mind, and if you be not so, my lord of Lichfield, you are much to blame. Nay, quoth the bishop, I am very glad that things are thus answered and solved, I seek not to destroy the man, but if it please your grace, I will proceed to another objection. Let it be to some purpose then, quoth the duke, for hitherto nothing has been said that is of any moment. And to this saying most of the lords agreed."

Then followed a dispute about the number of the Sacraments, and whether the Church of Rome had erred in fundamentals. When the lords had agreed to an adjournment, the duke said, surely if these be the greatest matters you be grieved with, I can see no reason but Mr. Montague should be defended. The chiefest matter is behind, said Lord Say, which is about falling from grace, and the definitions of the Council of Dort. I beseech your lordships, said the dean, that we of the Church of England be not put to borrow a new faith from any village in the Netherlands. And the Calvinistic views of the accusers and their total ignorance and neglect and denial of the Church's teaching being made apparent, the Court broke up. They met again a few days later, but no account of their doings is extant. Mr. Montague was present and answered for himself.

The sum of the whole is this:—

"The gross heresies propounded by Mr. Montague were these:

1. General Councils, lawful, &c., cannot err in fundamentals.
2. We go to heaven and hell according to our deservings.
3. Justification taken largely, comprehendeth good works.
4. A woman is not held by us to be supreme governor in causes ecclesiastical, but in reference to persons that may be forced to do their duties in them.
5. As Lucifer fell from heaven, so man may fall from grace.
6. God is not substantially mixed with all things, as the Stoics held.
7. The Church of Rome and ours stand firm upon one and the main foundation.
8. We allow more Sacraments than two.

9. The Pope is not that great Antichrist. Montague, says the *Chronieler*, answered all his opposers with perspicuous brevity, and delight to all that were present, unless my Lord Say. Not a lord besides him and Warwick, but expressed themselves ashamed of such poor objections, and highly satisfied with such a plain, ingenious, and learned exposition, as Mr. Montague made of himself. * * * * The news was presently related to the King, who swears his perpetual patronage of our cause."

The King did not keep this promise, but presently, in order to throw a tub to the whale, as some say, or else, as others, to appease the puritanic clamour, which grew louder and louder at every yielding, called the book in, ordering all persons who had a copy of it to deliver it up.

The House of Commons took the matter in hand and submitted the "Appello" to a committee. Mr. Pym brought in the report, which was necessarily adverse to Montague, and entirely innocent of theological knowledge. Here the matter seemed to have dropped.

"He that reads the *Gag*, and the *Appello Cæsarem* of Bishop Montague," says the learned Heylyn, "cannot but see that those opinions which our author (Thomas Fuller) condemned for private, were the true doctrine of this Church professed and held forth in the Book of Articles, the Homilies, and the Common Prayer Book."*

Jeremy Taylor, in a letter, January 13, 1659, recommends among other books on our Controversy with Rome—"Bp. Montague against the Gagger"—and on Ecclesiastical History, his *History of the Church*, *i. e.* presumably, his "Acts and Monuments of the Church before Christ incarnate."†

Fuller himself, who did not share Montague's views, has no ill word to say of him. Even in speaking of the famous Appello, he lays no blame to him for the uproar which it occasioned.

"He hath many learned works extant against the Papists, some in English, some in Latin, and one, called his '*Appello Cæsarem*,' which (without his intent and against his will) gave occasion of much trouble in the land."‡

* Heylyn's *Examen Historicum*, 1659, p. 205.

† See Taylor's *Works*, Eden's edition, vol. I., lxxxix.

‡ Fuller's *Worthies of England*, Tegg's ed., Vol. 1, p. 201.

"He spent very much in repairing his parsonage house at Petworth, as also on his Episcopal house at Allingbourne, near Chichester."*

Montague was made bishop of Chichester in 1628 and, ten years afterwards, was translated to Norwich.

"But, says Fuller, all in his diocese not being so well skilled in antiquity as himself, some charged him with superstitious urging of ceremonies; and being accused in parliament, he appeared not, being very weak, but went a more compendious way to answer all in the high court of heaven."†

Such was the man and such his history. There were accusations and assertions against him in plenty, but his enemies, when brought to the book, were brought also to shame and confusion. It seems strange to-day that any sane man could ever have disputed most of Montague's positions. Over others again the contest is still fierce, and likely to continue so while misunderstandings are so easy, and misconceptions so nigh at hand.

Modern readers, if they know Montague at all, know him through Hallam.‡ Or it may be through Greene,§ who evidently draws what he says from Hallam. Hallam is very bitter against Montague, accuses him of intrigues with Panzani, the Pope's agent in England, for a restoration of a union with Rome, or rather of a submission to her, and a good deal more of the same sort.

His authority for all this is the *Memoirs of Panzani*, published by Joseph Berington in 1793, which, Hallam tells us, is a scarce book and not often quoted, and also, that some account of it may be found in Butler's *Memoirs of English, &c., Catholics*, vol. iv.

A copy of this scarce book is in the Philadelphia Library.‖ The full title is:—

"The history of the decline and fall of the Roman Catholic religion in England, during a period of 240 years, from the reign of Elizabeth to the present time; including the memoirs of Gregorio Panzani, envoy from Rome to the English Court in 1643, 1644, and 1645 [a mistake for 1633, 1634, and 1635], with many interesting

* Ibid.

† Fuller's *Church History of Great Britain*, Book XI, Sec. iv.

‡ *Constitutional History of England*.

§ *Short History of the English People*.

‖ 6514, O.

particulars relative to the Court of Charles I., and the causes of the civil War. Translated from the Italian original. By the Rev. Joseph Berington. London, 1813."

This volume, excepting the title page, came out in 1793, calling itself then *Memoirs of Gregorio Panzani, &c. &c.* There is no pretence of its being a second edition. It is merely a reissue with a new title. The date within is Oscott, May 1, 1793.

Berington says: "Whether the memoirs were written by Panzani himself or composed from the materials he supplied, does not appear, nor is it of moment." Charles Dodd, the Roman Catholic historian, whose book, "*The Church History of England*," appeared in 1737, obtained, so Berington says, an accurate translation of the original memoirs "some years ago" from Rome. These original memoirs were never published, and were "not in above one or two hands." The translation was made "by an eminent prelate of singular candour and scrupulosity," i. e., Dr. Witham, who was Vicar Apostolic of the midland district of English Catholics in the year 1703. Of these memoirs Dodd himself published only a few extracts. From prudential motives, continues Berington, he re-arranged his materials, and proposed to issue them as the memoirs of (Sir Francis) Windebank,* Secretary of State. But even this he did not accomplish. He died, leaving the two manuscripts; one, called *Memoirs of Gregorio Panzani*; and the other, *Memoirs of Windebank*; but both containing the same matter. Both manuscripts, Berington says, are in his possession. And both, he seems to say, though his language is here obscure, have been made use of in the volume before us.†

Berington is a very bitter writer, and vehemently opposed

* Sir Francis Windebank having escaped to France (1640), on perceiving the temper of the House of Commons, of which he was a member, was there "formally reconciled to the Church of Rome," and died in 1646.

† "Mr. Dodd, however, was extremely desirous of publishing these memoirs, in which he saw, he thought, many things that were interesting, and which would throw light on a dark and misrepresented period. He, therefore, brought the principal materials together under a new title, meaning to publish them as the memoirs of Windebank, the Secretary of State, who was much engaged in the transaction. I am in possession of his MSS. in this form, as also under the original title, of which I avail myself."

* Berington's Preface, vii.

to the Jesuits. He attacks the Rev. Charles Plowden, author of many historical works; the well-known Rev. John Milner; and especially Father Parsons, at one time head of the Jesuits in England.

Now on a book which appeared in 1793, and called itself, at best, the publication of a translation made somewhere between 1700 and 1735, of a manuscript of the date of 1636 or 1637, which had never been in more than one or two hands, we are asked by Mr. Hallam to pin our faith, and with him help to destroy the good fame of one of the Church of England's chiefest champions. I say at best, for it is doubtful, exceedingly so, what is genuine and what is not, in a book, which may be the memoirs of any one the writer chooses. At all events, F. Charles Plowden in the year 1794 came out in a book denying the authenticity of the pretended memoirs.

"After publishing this clever book," says Dr. Oliver in his Contributions towards the History of the English, Irish, and Scotch Jesuits, "he procured an Italian copy of the original Memoirs of Panzani from the Vatican library, which convicts Dodd of dishonesty as an historian. But F. John Constable in 1740, just before Plowden was born, had treated them [*i. e.*, such extracts as Dodd had published] in his reply to Dodd, as 'pretended memoirs,' and asks 'can you expect the public to be so imposed upon as to mind them?'"

Hallam is without excuse, for the very book he refers to (namely, Butler's English Catholics) to substantiate these memoirs, tells him enough in the note at page 331, &c., vol. 2 [edition of 1822, in 4 vols.], to put him on his guard. And indeed Berington's own preface should have done this. He, Berington, writing in 1793, says, Mr. Dodd "some years ago" obtained his translation. It is not in accordance with the ordinary rules of language to call a century, or even half a century, "some years ago." And yet between 1700 or 1735 and 1793 is nearly that space of time. Mr. Hallam, besides, could hardly have been ignorant of Plowden's book, even if he had never seen Constable's. It really seems as if finding what looked like a chance of dealing a good blow at the dead lion, he was in a haste to deal it, and did not take pains to see whether it were fairly dealt or no.

“The whole tenor of the narrative,” says a gentleman of this city who has examined into the question, “shows that it is not Panzani who writes, but another. Two places are conclusive evidence. For in both Panzani is praised for his many good qualities, his experienced virtue, singular address, polite learning, the zeal and constancy that were always conspicuous in his conduct, &c. Surely no man would ever write in such terms of himself.”

Berington tells us that he is so thoroughly convinced of the authenticity of the memoirs, that he did not even trouble himself to write to Rome about them, which he could easily have done had he thought it necessary.

But let us suppose that they are genuine and authentic, and just what they purport to be. What, after all, be they what they may, do they assert of Montague? Panzani claims to have had three interviews with Montague, whom he calls a vain prelate, and whose vanity he flatters by telling him how highly he is thought of at Rome, and how greatly his works are esteemed there. In his account of one of these, he says Montague declared that he would gladly throw himself at the feet of his holiness, that he would acknowledge his supremacy in things spiritual, but denied transubstantiation, and had grave doubts as to the withdrawal of the cup. In that of the second, he says that Montague maintained his character (*i. e.* of a bishop of the Church of God) and his priesthood; and that he, Panzani, had declined to discuss such matters, as beyond his province. In the final interview, Montague, among other things,

“Said something relating to the correction of the Calendar, owning that the Roman computation was much more exact; and he believed the Protestants would easily be induced to adopt it.”

And the question of “Orders” again coming up, Montague said that his were derived from St. Augustin, the apostle of England.

“Panzani managed as before, telling him it was a tedious, intricate controversy, the particulars whereof he was a stranger to.”

Montague at this, which appears to have been the final interview, referred again to the Church of France as being nearest to that of England in doctrine and discipline, and thought

well of a Congress to be held in that country, to confer about the differences which separated England from the rest of the Latin Church.

Panzani, on reporting his first interview to Rome, was instructed to dwell "upon generals," but also to state that "They might assure themselves, the Bishop of Rome would make no unreasonable demands, but content himself with the essentials of his primacy, and such privileges as were annexed to it *jure divino*."

And this is absolutely all that is reported to have passed between them. And the sum of all put in modern terms is, that if the Pope would give up transubstantiation, and restore the cup to the laity, and would also acknowledge the validity of the English orders, he, Montague, for his part, and he thought he could speak for others, would acknowledge that the chair of Peter, as the Apostolic See of the West, was entitled to a primacy of honour, and that its bishop was first among equals. This, I suppose, no one who desires to have restored a visible unity once more, would think of denying. But what Pope, from Leo X. to Leo XIII., would have dreamed of conceding Montague's demands?

Charles Dodd's real name seems to have been Richard or Hugh Tootle, though Mr. Berington calls him always Dodd, and says he resided in Worcestershire, and died about 1745. Dodd's Church History of England, which has the imprint of Brussels on it, was really printed in England.

Dodd, in "Remarks subjoined to the MS. copy of the memoirs," says:—

"It remains that I caution the reader as to the use and credit of this relation of Panzani's agency. * * * * If the author was not Panzani, he certainly was some other who had his memoirs and private notes in keeping. * * * * I have sometimes taken the liberty to open the style, without at all altering the sense, or omitting any passage in the relation."*

Berington's book, the so-called Memoirs of Panzani, or Windebank, by Charles Dodd, inserted in it, and Charles Dodd's History, if we may judge from extracts and from remarks about it, were all of them written or compiled in the

* Page 258.

interest of the seculars, and against the regulars in England. The abuse of the Jesuits is the one connecting thread that runs through Berington's production. With all this we have no concern at all. But it does seem hard that the fair name of one of England's worthiest sons should have been darkened for a moment by such a self-confessed imposture, founded, doubtless, on Panzani's Report of his Mission, but handled and rehandled by Dodd (and apparently by Berington too, for that matter) at his pleasure.

The writers of the "History of the Christian Church," published originally, for the most part, in the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, and reprinted by Griffin in 1858,* say of Montague, and here I leave it:—

"Richard Montague was one of the great revivers of primitive theology in the English Church. He was almost the first of the Anglican writers who have distinguished themselves by their works on ecclesiastical antiquity."

I regret that I have not been able to consult "The Gag," there being no copy within reach. The extract that follows on Confession is from "The Gag," and is quoted by Dr. Pusey, in his Preface to his translation of the Abbé Gaume's Manual. That on the Holy Eucharist is from the same work, as quoted in "The Tracts for the Times."†

CONFESSION.

"It is confessed that all priests, and none but priests, have power to forgive sins: it is confessed that private confession unto a priest is of very ancient practice in the Church, of excellent use and practice being discreetly handled. We refuse it to none, if men require it, if need be to have it. We urge it and persuade it in extremes. We require it in case of perplexity, for the quieting of men disturbed in their consciences."

HOLY EUCHARIST.

"For why? Who can alter Christ's institution? Who dare change that which He hath ordained? 'He (the priest) doth then

* Vol. 4, page 300.

† No. 81, page 107.

offer in the Church to God the Father, a true and full sacrifice, if he begin so to offer, even as he seeth Christ Himself did offer,' saith St. Cyprian. 'But,' saith he again, and we know it is true, 'it is acknowledged that the Lord offered the cup for the commemoration of the Passion. And because we make mention of His passion at every Sacrifice, we ought to do nothing else than what He did.' Why? because otherwise we offer not the Sacrifice as we should. 'Neither do we celebrate the Lord's sacrifice with a lawful hallowing, except our Oblation and Sacrifice answer to the Passion:' and that cannot be without pouring out of wine, that representeth the shedding of His blood. 'But your Church hath altered it, presumptuously done. Who gave your Church such authority?' Hear St. Cyprian again. 'Wherefore if Christ alone is to be heard, we ought not to attend to what any other before us hath thought should be done, but what He Who is before all, even Christ, first did. For we ought not to follow the custom of men, but the truth of God. For if Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, be Himself the High priest of God the Father, and first offered Himself a Sacrifice to the Father, and commanded that this should be done for the commemoration of Him, then verily that priest doth truly fulfil his office in Christ's stead, who copieth that which Christ did; and doth then offer in the Church to God the Father a true and full Sacrifice, if he so begin to offer, even as he seeth Christ Himself did offer.' You do not this; therefore, in St. Cyprian's judgment your Sacrifice is neither full nor true."

Through the intervention of my dear friend, the Rev. Dr. Yarnall, of this city, who has taken a deep interest in these researches about Bishop Richard Montague, and has given all important assistance to them; and the very great kindness of the Rev. Dr. Seabury, of the General Theological Seminary, who owns this exceedingly rare tractate, I have been enabled to read the "Appello Cæsarem."

This little volume, which once made a great noise in England—owing more to the circumstances of the times and the inflamed state of political opinion than to the contents of the book itself—is a very diminutive quarto of 322 pages, with an epistle dedicatory to Charles I. and the approbation of Dr. Francis White, Dean of Carlisle, dated February 15, 1624.

The first half of the book treats of *Arminianism*, the second and longer half of *Popery*; both of which, as we know, had been charged against Montague.

At page 10 he says.—

“ I disavow the name and title of Arminian, I am no more Arminian, than they Gomarians:* not so much in all probability. They delight it seemeth, to be called after men's names, for anon they stick not to call themselves Calvinists: which title though more honorable than Gomarian or Arminian, I am not so fond of, or doting upon, but I can be content to leave it unto those that affect it, and hold it in reputation to be so instilled. I am not, nor would be accounted willingly, Arminian, Calvinist, or Lutheran (names of division), but a Christian. For my faith was never taught by the doctrine of men. I was not baptized into the Belief, or assumed by grace into the family of any of these, or of the Pope. I will not pin my belief unto any man's sleeve, carry he his head never so high; not unto St. Augustine, or any ancient father, let alone unto men of lower rank. A Christian I am, and so glory to be; only denominated of Christ Jesus, my Lord and Master, by Whom I never was as yet so wronged, that I would relinquish willingly that royal title, and exchange it for any of His menial servants. And further yet I do profess, that I see no reason why any member of the Church of England, a Church every way so transcendant unto that of Leyden [Arminius] and Geneva, should lowt so low as to denominate himself of any the most eminent among them.”

He denies that he ever read a word of Arminius, and asserts that from his first entrance upon the study of divinity, avoiding all by-paths, he betook himself to—

“ Scripture the Rule of Faith, interpreted by antiquity, the best expositor of Faith, and applier of that rule: holding it a point of discretion, to draw water, as near as I could to the well-head, and to spare labour in vain, in running further off to cisterns and lakes. I went to enquire, when doubt was, of the days of old, as God Himself directed me; and hitherto I have not repented me of it. I have not found any canon, order, act, direction in the Church of England against it: for it I have found many.”

He maintains against the Calvinists that grace once had may be lost, leaning on the teaching of the Church of England. And abhors, detests, and inveighs against their “com-

* Arminius attempted to soften the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, and Francis Gomarus, his colleague in Leyden, violently opposed him.

fortable" doctrine of predestination unto damnation. And develops the true meaning and intent of the XVII. Article. And then in these glowing words he declares his love and devotion to his mother, the Church:—

"If none of these take notice of your divines, what are private men's opinions unto me, who may be as free in my opinions as they are in theirs? But I do not, as you inform, *declare* any such thing; for *to declare* importeth a public act, an assent upon acknowledgment. Do I in this chapter profess correspondency in the point controverted with Lutherans? Do I anywhere, with them or others, beside the Church of England, the absolutest representation of Antiquity this day extant? What that church believeth, I believe; what it teacheth, I teach; what it rejecteth, I reject; what it doth not tender, I am not tied unto. I was bred a member of the Church of England, brought up a member of the Church of England; therein by the means and ministry of that church I received that earnest of my salvation, when by Baptism I was inserted into Christ. In the union and communion of that church I have lived, not divided with papist, nor separated with puritan. Through the assistance of the grace of God's Spirit, which is never wanting unto any that seek Him, I hope to live and die in the faith and confession of that church; than which I know none, nor can any be named in all points more conformable unto purest antiquity in the best times: which I trust to make good against any and all those brethren in evil, papists and puritans, whosoever: who looking and running two several ways, do, like Samson's foxes, join together in the tail. If there be in any writing, preaching, saying, or thought of mine, anything delivered or published against the discipline or doctrine of this church, I am sorry for it, I revoke it, recant it, disclaim it. *Vultu læditur pietas*; if I have done so in anything unto my mother, in all humility I crave pardon, and will undergo penance. But the presumptions of servants are not the Lord's directions. Every one that prateth, readeth, lectureth, preacheth, or professeth, must not look to have his theses, lections, harangues, or discourses taken as the dictates or doctrines of our church. Our mother hath sufficiently made known her mind in her public, promulgated, authorized Articles and Communion Book; with those other, to which we have all subscribed, that are publicly interested in the priesthood and function of this church."*

* Ibid., p. 47.

Man has free will, he says, and exercises it, and if he finally perish, it is not that God wills it.

“Unless from damned heretics, or stoical philosophers, I never yet read in antiquity of any prime, previous determining decree, by which men were *irrespectively* denied grace, excluded from glory, or enforced to salvation; as they must be, that cannot perish if they would, nor can be saved though most they desire it.”*

“The will of man is a true natural faculty, given to man in his creation. In the state of corruption, this natural faculty is a true efficient cause of sin, and this natural faculty is punished for sin. In the state of justification, the same natural faculty is truly and really endued with grace, and bringeth forth the works of righteousness, and shall be rewarded with glory and immortality. In both these states the will is a true efficient; but differently: a principal efficient in the first state; a subordinate efficient in the second, because the Holy Ghost activateth and enableth it.”†

He begins the second part, that on Popery, thus:—

“Now come they to Popery in a larger extent. A strange imputation, in my opinion, considering the subject upon which they work: which may argue in them, with any indifferent reader, an uncharitable, unchristian, fiery, puritanical zeal, malice, and indiscretion too. * * * * It is not the first time, for this very cause, I have been talked of, esteemed of, traduced as a papist: which I can the better brook, because they have meted this measure to the Church of England itself, as sympathizing with papists in her liturgy, discipline, and doctrine too. * * * * I call God and His holy angels to witness, I nor am, nor have been, nor intend to be hereafter, either papist, or Romish Catholic; a papist of state, or of religion; but a priest, a member, a follower of the Church of England. * * * * In profession thereof, I have lived, and will die; and will maintain it by God’s grace, to be ancient, catholic, orthodox, and apostolical. I say it again, I never was or will be a papist, no, not in heart; though many be arrant Puritans in heart, that only for preferment do conform; hold with the hare and run with the hound: who so they might *vivere* and *valere*, would as willingly have up the Presbyterian anarchy as would Thomas Cartwright, were he living; though many, once Puritans turn often papists. And no marvel: for fleeting is commonly from

* Page 68.

† Page 93.

one extreme unto another. Men of moving, violent, quicksilver, gunpowder spirits, can never rely upon middling courses, but run on headlong into extremes. And so, I may avow, I will not be a papist in haste, because I never was a Puritan in earnest or in jest; having found it true, in my small observation, that our revolvers unto popery were Puritans avowed or addicted first.”*

So far from being a papist, he declares that though he does not think the Pope *the* Antichrist, still he does think him *an* Antichrist, but that the Turk has far more the signs of Antichrist than any other has.

“And yet farther: Mahomet the Great, having taken Constantinople, and ruined the empire of the Greeks, sat him down, and made his palace in the cathedral church of St. Sophia; and in the close and cloister, the bishops’ and priests’ lodgings thereabouts, where is his seraglio unto this day. Part of that large and admirablest piece of work, one of the wonders of the world, the church of St. Sophia, namely, the chancel of that church, where stood the high altar or communion table and patriarchal throne, is now made and so used as a Turkish mosque; whither the Grand Signior also himself goeth often a procession unto their service, or blasphemous rites and ceremonies of their religion.”†

“For in resolution I say with that Jewell of England in page 393, ‘I will not say the pope is Antichrist. God will reveal him in his time, and he shall be known;’ and yet it is probable he may be of that rank. I will not say the Turk is Antichrist; though it be probable, that Antichrist may come from thence; the Turk’s power being increased and enlarged by the pope’s policy as the same Bishop Jewell hath observed it well, that it may not seem strange, two opposite in state may conspire in opposing piety.”‡

Montague believes that we are made righteous and not only called so. He holds to evangelical counsels, quoting in favour of this opinion, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Augustine, Chrysostom. He asserts that the Apostles and saints of God belong to “that part of the Church universal which is now regnant § in heaven,” and again, “The Church is invisible in her more noble parts; the Saints, both regnant in heaven, and militant in earth; such as be *secreti* and *occulte intus*; such as be the

* Page 110.

† Page 155.

‡ Page 159.

§ Page 121.

secret, hidden, the reserved ones of God, as jewels of price, of value, of account.”* And that these saints enjoy the beatific Vision.†

He maintains very forcibly the propriety and rightfulness of signing with the sign of the Cross, the forehead, the breast, and elsewhere, out of baptism, as well as at baptism, supporting his views by copious reference to the fathers, and says truly enough, “The reason that moved them that might move us to use often signing. They lived with pagans, and we with puritans; both deriders of the sign of Christ’s cross.”‡ And again§ of the great spiritual helps derived from using the sacred sign.

“And what if I meant some experimental effects of my own knowledge? What then? Can you control or convince me? I am not bound to confess myself to you: but what if upon diverse extremities I have found ease and remedy by using that ejaculatory prayer of our Litany, By Thy Cross (and when I said it, what if, to testify my faith, I made the sign of the Cross?) and by Thy passion, good Lord deliver us? I cannot tell what you will say: but you know well, that some of your lewd forefathers have accounted this, and a great deal more of that heavenly prayer, to be no better than conjuring. If you will be rightly informed, it is not by the bare sign of the Cross that any such effect cometh, but by the virtue and force of Christ’s death and passion then remembered, and at that time represented by the sign of the Cross.”

The XXX Chapter is on the real presence.

“The difference, he says, betwixt us and popish writers is only about the *modus*, the manner of Christ’s presence in the blessed sacrament. Agreement likely to be made, but for the factious and inquiet spirits on both sides. Blessed are the peacemakers.”

“Concerning this point I said, and I say so still, that if men were disposed, as they ought, unto peace, there need be no difference, and I added a reason, which I repeat again here—The disagreement is only *de modo præsentix*: the thing is yielded to on either side, that there is in the holy Eucharist, a real presence. God forbid, says Bishop Bilson, we should deny that the flesh and blood of Christ are truly present, and truly received of the faithful at the Lord’s Table. It is the doctrine that we teach others and comfort

* Page 135.

† Page 247.

‡ Page 265.

§ Page 280.

ourselves withall.* And the reverend and learned Answerer unto Bellarmine's Apology, cometh home to the faith, or popery, if you will, condemned in Mr. Montague, who learned it of him, and such as he is. '*Nobis vobiscum de objecto convenit, de modo lis omnis est.*'†

He quotes also the "incomparable Hooker," whom he calls *Puritanomastix*, as entirely agreeing with him.

Of Confession he asserts that it is the express direction and practice of the Church of England. That it is no new Popish custom, but that the ancient and pious manner of confession, for the help and furtherance of men's true repentance, and for continuing of them in amendment of life, is, may be, and ought to be, urged. Also how confession of sins to a priest is required by the church before the receiving of the Lord's Supper. And he quotes the well-known passage from Usher in support of his assertion.‡

That the Puritans should have hated and persecuted the man, was to be expected, of course, for he unsparingly exposed their ignorance, scouted their authorities, and showed their faithlessness to the Church they had sworn to serve, and from which they derived their living. But how any one could accuse him of Popery from this book, or deny his allegiance to his church, or why the feeble and fickle Charles I. should have suppressed it, passes comprehension.

The authorities Montague quotes are authorities to-day, read, quoted, relied on, known by all men. The authorities of his adversaries have fallen into forgetfulness; even their very names are unknown to those who now walk in their footsteps. Montague's arguments are our arguments also, drawn from the Articles and the Prayer Book. We go as he did to the Scriptures, and to the ancient writers, as its best interpreters. Having the well of living waters as our own, we, with him, do not run after cisterns, broken cisterns that hold no water. The defenders of the truth have no need to change. The defenders of error change every year, every week, every day. They have new notions, new authorities, new teachers, new heroes. These last for a moment, and then sink away into nothingness and mere oblivion, forsaken and abandoned

* True difference, &c. p. 779.

† Pp. 288, 289.

‡ P. 297.

of all men; dust, ashes, stubble. "As for the truth, it endureth, and is always strong; it liveth and conquereth for evermore. With her there is no accepting of persons, or rewards; but she doeth the things that are just, and refraineth from all unjust and wicked things; and all men do well like of her works. Neither in her judgment is any unrighteousness; and she is the strength, kingdom, power, and majesty of all ages. Blessed be the God of truth."

As for the Pope or the Turk being Antichrist: in those days both were temporal powers, and both were feared and dreaded; but now that both have ceased to have any temporal power, and both are neither feared nor dreaded, nobody thinks of calling either Antichrist; though very many hate the Pope a good deal more than they do the Turk. And England, that was once Christian, seems to have taken the place of France in bolstering the Turk up, and in shedding or causing to be shed Christian blood, to keep up the crescent, and to keep down the cross; and to hinder and put back the happy day, so longed, so prayed for, by myriads of Christian hearts, when once again the glorious Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom shall resound through that gorgeous pile of St. Sophia—desecrated and trampled under foot these four hundred years—once the wonder of the world, stately and beautiful, built in honour of the Most High by the great Justinian, who exclaimed in the exultation of his heart, on the day of its consecration, now, Solomon, thou art conquered.

AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

X.—DE CÆNA DOMINI.

De Cœna Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint, et distribuantur vescentibus in cœna Domini et improbant secus docentes.

Englished in the Appendix to Page's edition of Burnet on the Articles, London, 1841, thus:—

In regard to the Lord's Supper, they teach that the body and blood of Christ are actually present under the emblems of bread and wine, and are dispensed to the communicants.

German in "Die Ehre und Lehre der Augspurgischen Confession zum Behuf und Nutzen der Evangelischen Schuljugend, &c. von Johannes Weidner." Ulm, 1732 (Phil. Library (9142 D.)).

Vom Abendmahl der Herrn wird also gelehret, dass wahrer Leib und Blut Christi wahrhaftiglich unter des Gestalt des Brods und Weins, im Abendmahl gegenwärtig sey, und da ausgetheilet und genommen wird. Derhalben wird auch die Gegenlehre verworffen.

Weidner says, page 162:—

2. "Im heil. Abendmahl ist wahrer Leib und Blut Christi wahrhaftig gegenwärtig. Nicht nur *objective*, oder, dass wir an den Leib und Blut Christi gedennen, glauben, und dieselben geistlicher Weise essen. Auch nicht nur *effective*, dass der Leib und Blut Jesu in uns Trost und Kraft, Vergebung der Sünden, Leben und Seeligkeit würcke; sondern *substantialiter*, dass der Leib und Blut Jesu ihrem Wesen nach wahrhaftig da und gegenwärtig seyen."

And on page 161:—

"Des Herrn Abendmahl aber heisset es, nicht, als ob es der Herr Jesus selbst gebraucht habe, massen hievon das Evangelium nichts meldet, und es ein Sacrament ist, eingesetzt zur Vergebung der Sünden, dessen unser Heyland, als der ohne Sünde war, nicht bedurfte, und vor Einsetzung desselben Seinen Jüngern ausdrücklich bezeugte: Ich werde forthin nicht mehr trincken von dem Gewächs des Weinstocks; Sondern weil Er, der Herr dasselbe seiner Jüngern und Glaubigen gestiftet, und zu einer Speise und Tranck ins ewige Leben, und zwar zu Seiner Gedächtniss verordnet hat."

XI.—DE CONFESSIOE.

De confessione docent quod absolutio privata in ecclesiis retinenda sit quanquam in confessione non sit necessaria omnium delictorum enumeratio. Est enim impossibilis juxta Psalmum xix. 12. Delicta quis intelligit?

In regard to confession, they teach that private absolution ought to be retained in the churches; but that an enumeration of all our transgressions is not requisite in confession. For this is an impossibility, according to the declaration of the Psalmist: "Who can understand his errors?"

Von der Beicht wird also gelehret, dass man in der Kirchen *privatam absolutionem* erhalten und nicht fallen lassen soll, wiewohl in der Beicht nicht noth ist, alle Missethat und Sünden zu erzehlen, dieweil doch solches nicht möglich ist. Psalm 18. Wer kennet die missethat?

Weidner says, page 171:—

"Oder aber sie wird *privatim*, ingeheim, und insbesondere gegen einem Diener Jesu Christi gethan, so man die Ohren-beicht zu nennen pfl eget, weil dieselbe in der Stille und mit leiser Stimme gemeiniglich abgelegt wird.

"Solche aber hat abermal entweder eine gewisse, bestimmte Zeit, oder nicht.

"Eigentlich hat sie keine bestimmte Zeit, sondern, wenn ein Sünder in seinem Hertzen empfindet und fühlet, und er vor Angst seines Hertzens sich nicht zu fassen noch zu trösten weiss, so ist ihm die Gelegenheit, einem Kirchen-Diener zu beichten allezeit offen: Oder auch, wann ein Seelsorger von jemand etwas innen wird, so wider den Glauben und das Gewissen streitet, auch deshalb sein sogenantes Beicht-Kind zu befragen hat, so ist hie keine gewisse Zeit benahmset, wenn die Beicht abgelegt oder gefordert werden solle: Jezuweilen aber hat die Beicht ihre bestimmte Zeit, nemlich die Zeit einer öffentlichen Buss-Andacht, da von der Kirche Gottes verordnet worden ist, dass niemand möge zum Heil-Abendmahl gelassen werden, als der zuvor gebeichtet hat.

"Man soll in der Kirchen *privatam absolutionem* erhalten, und nicht fallen lassen. *Privata absolutio* heisset die besondere Losprechung von Sünden.

"Sie wird aber eine besondere *Absolution* genennet in Vergleichung der allgemeinen Absolution, krafft deren eine gantze Gemeinde öffentlich von Sünden losgesprochen wird. Nemlich so wohl, wenn

denen, so betrübtes Hertzens sind, und im Glauben an Christum Vergebung der Sünden ernstlich verlangen, das Wort der Evangelii von der Gnade Gottes in Christo Jesu nicht nur verkündigt, sondern appliceret, und einem jeden insonderheit zugeeignet wird; als auch wenn einem Beicht-Kind besonders in dem Beicht-stuhl, und vor dem Genuss der Heil-Abendmahls die *Absolution* ertheilet wird, das wird eine *Privat-absolution* genennet.

“Und von dieser Art der Absolution redet unsere Confession in diesen Articul, dass man sie in der Kirchen erhalten, und nicht fallen lassen solle. Die Ursach dessen ist leicht zu ersehen. Denn diese besondere Beicht und *Absolution*, ehe man zum Heil-Abendmahl gelassen wird, ist sehr nützlich, und in gewisser Masse nöthig.”

And on page 175:—

“Dahero unser seeliger *Lutherus* von der Beicht recht nachdrücklich sreibet: Wenn tausend Welt und aber tausend Welt mein wären, so wollte ich alles lieber verliehren, denn dass ich wollte dieser Beicht das geringste Stücklein eines aus der Kirche lassen, u. s. w.”



